

*Garcia*  
*3*

-----X

In the matter of:

COMPULSORY LICENSE FOR SECONDARY

TRANSMISSIONS BY CABLE SYSTEMS;

ROYALTY ADJUSTMENT PROCEEDING

CRT Docket No. 80-3

-----X

2100 K Street, N.W.  
Room 610  
Washington, D.C.

Thursday, October 2, 1980

The hearing in the above-entitled matter commenced  
at 10:00 a.m., pursuant to notice.

BEFORE:

MARY LOU BURG, Chairman

THOMAS C. BRENNAN, Commissioner

CLARENCE L. JAMES, Jr., Commissioner

FRANCES GARCIA, Commissioner

## APPEARANCES:

FRITZ ATTAWAY, Attorney-at-Law  
Counsel for Copyright Owners

STUART F. FELDSTEIN, Attorney-at-Law  
Counsel for NCTA

C O N T E N T SWITNESS:DirectCrossRedirectRecross

CHARLOTTE BEALES

by Mr. Feldstein

4

103

by Mr. Attaway

30

EXHIBITS:IDENTIFIEDRECEIVED

NCTA's No. 14

17

17

NCTA's No. 15

60

60

CO's No. 18

125

125

1 CHAIRMAN BURG: After our expected, and yet,  
2 unexpected vacation yesterday, it is nice to be back in harness.  
3 Ms. Beales, you were on the witness stand. So, Mr. Feldstein,  
4 you may continue with you witness.

5 MR. FELDSTEIN: Thank you.

6 Whereupon,

7 CHARLOTTE BEALES

8 was called as a witness and, still under oath, was examined and  
9 testified further, as follows:

10 DIRECT EXAMINATION

11 BY MR. FELDSTEIN:

12 Q It will be recalled that the witness had concluded her  
13 demonstration of the increase in the royalty fee per subscriber  
14 between October of 1976 and the latest date for which data was  
15 available, which would be January 1, 1980. She had then commenced  
16 to explain what factors might be contributing to this increase in  
17 the royalty fee per subscriber.

18 And I think, at this point, I would ask Mr. Beales to  
19 take it from there and set the stage as to where she feels she is  
20 in describing this component?

21 A This, as a point of review, you will recall that we had  
22 already discussed Chart Seven, which was our tabulation of the  
23 reponses to the Copyright Tribunal Survey. We had come up with a  
24 change in basic subscriber rates of 15 percent for all systems,  
25 and 14 percent for the DSE systems based on the tabulation at the  
time we conducted our analysis.

We are about ready to move on to Chart Eight.

COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Ms. Beales, before you do, that

*Accurate Reporting Co., Inc.*

(202) 726-3801



1 exhibit is equivalent to the Copyright Owners Exhibit No. 2, is  
2 that right?

3 THE WITNESS: I'm not positive if it is Exhibit 2. Let  
4 me check that. It is somewhat different as I pointed out on  
5 Exhibit 2. Mine are not numbered. It is comparable to basic  
6 rates of all long-form cable systems.

7 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: They are all numbered, prenum-  
8 bered, aren't they?

9 THE WITNESS: The one I was using was not. It is  
10 similar, but it is somewhat different. The reason that it is  
11 somewhat different is that in that particular Exhibit No. 2  
12 of the copyright owners, it's my understanding that they compared  
13 the same systems in 1976 and and 1980. With our data, we  
14 compared all systems who responded because we were doing an  
15 industry wide average.

16 For all systems, we had a different number you will  
17 recall. We had \$1,673 that were operational in '76 that  
18 responded, but that number had increased to 1900. So, there is  
19 a difference in the methodology.

20 If you will turn to Chart No. 8, you will recall that  
21 we were attempting to give you some idea of other components  
22 that may have increased which will contribute to an increase  
23 in the royalty fee per subscriber. Obviously, a change in the  
24 rate is the most significant component. As I had stated on  
25 Tuesday, we are not attempting to precisely quantify the change  
in these other factors because we do not have data from 1976.

1 All we have are other end times, but we also have other start  
2 times. We have some data which give us an indication that there  
3 has been some increase in the other factors that would affect  
4 the royalty fee per subscriber.

5 In Chart No. 8, we have a table that describes the  
6 increase in additional set revenues between 1978 and 1980. The  
7 source of this chart is a tabulation of 100 random selected  
8 1978-1 and 1979-2 statement of account forms. Hence, this table  
9 is only measuring an 18-month change rather than 1976 to 1980.

10 There are two parts of this chart that are important  
11 to look at. The first part is the additional set subscribers  
12 as the percentage of first set subscribers. We figured in 1978  
13 there was 30 percent; since 1979-2, it was 31 percent. It  
14 wasn't much of a change here, but we can see that it affected  
15 less than one-third of the total sets per subscribers.

16 The second part of the chart compares to basic rates.  
17 In '78-1, of these 100 selected statement accounts, the average  
18 rate was \$1.35; by 1972, it was \$1.51. We have an increase of  
19 \$12.10. So, we have some indication that there was a change  
20 in the additional set revenues that had increased during, at  
21 least, part of the period.

22 CHAIRMAN BURG: Ms. Beales, did you say 1972, when you  
23 meant 1979-2?

24 THE WITNESS: Dash two, yes. I'm sorry. As we move  
25 on to Chart Nine, we will look at two additional factors. The  
first factor listed is the average number of DSE's recorded

1 per system. The source of this information is, again,  
2 the 100 randomly selected statement of account forms. In 1978-1  
3 we have 2.65 recorded in our DSE samples. By 1979-2, it  
4 increased to 2.9, which is a nine percent increase. Keep in  
5 mind, of course, that this does not translate into a nine  
6 percent increase in the royalty fee per subscriber because you  
7 pay on a decreasing amount for each additional DSE that you would  
8 add.

9 The other factor that is shown on Chart Nine is system  
10 growth in the DSE payment category. We have included this  
11 because we are talking about, in many of our charts, all systems.  
12 And we know that many systems have internal growth where they  
13 increased their number of subscribers or they increased their  
14 basic rate which causes them to move from paying in category  
15 two into to category three. Again, we do not have precise  
16 quantification of this change. We know that the total reporting  
17 in 1978-1 that was paid in the DSE class was 868. By '79-2, the  
18 total reporting had grown to 1,050. That is a 21 percent  
19 increase. Now, there could be some other factors to fall into  
20 this, but given that's a relatively short 18-month period, it  
21 would seem that a large portion of this 21 percent could be  
22 attributed to internal growth which causes the system to pay at  
23 a higher DSE level.

24 These are, in essence, four factors, which we have  
25 found contribute to an increase to the royalty fee per  
subscriber. It was described on Tuesday as a 33 percent increase



1 over the period from '76 to 1980.

2 BY MR. FELDSTEIN:

3 Q Now, Ms. Beales, before we move to the topic of  
4 Regulatory Restraint, let me direct your attention to the  
5 exhibits introduced by the copyright owners, Exhibits No. 10 and  
6 10A, which, if you will recall, they refer to Exhibit 10 which  
7 referred to a series of franchise application cables in which  
8 the applicants of these various communities were listed along  
9 with some pricing for basic service tiers as well as paid  
10 TV tiers. The allusion that was made by the copyright owners  
11 from this exhibit was that the free or reduced price basic  
12 service, if not a thing being done commonly now, was certainly  
13 a coming trend.

14 Are you familiar with this exhibit?

15 A Yes, I am.

16 Q Have you examined the pages and the communities  
17 involved?

18 A Yes, I have.

19 Q Can you tell us how many of these cities are involved?  
20 How many are we talking about?

21 A In the packet that I received, there were 21 cities  
22 included.

23 Q One of the cities, as I recollect from looking through  
24 this, was named twice. It was a different table. Is that  
25 correct, and what was that?

A I believe Omaha was listed twice in the exhibit. In

1 looking at the footnotes and the actual applicants, one of them  
2 should be St. Louis.

3 Q So, we do have these 21 separate cities?

4 A Yes. I am assuming one was St. Louis based on the  
5 footnotes and the applicants. I'm not, of course, positive of  
6 that.

7 Q Do you know how many of these 21 cities have had a  
8 franchise awarded?

9 A Twelve.

10 Q You said 12 have had a franchise awarded?

11 A Yes, and nine have not.

12 Q Of these 12 that have been awarded, are any still in  
13 a contested state?

14 A Yes, four of them are in a contested state right now.  
15 So, there is no progress being made in terms of actually wiring  
16 the city.

17 Q Thus, eight of them are ready to go in some fashion,  
18 is that correct?

19 A Yes.

20 Q How many of these eight are actually in operation  
21 today?

22 A Three.

23 Q Can you identify the communities and the award winner  
24 of these three which are in operation?

25 A Yes, the first one that I found was Fargo.

CHAIRMAN BURG: At this point, I'm going to ask you to

1 slow down?

2 THE WITNESS: Certainly. They are not numbered, so  
3 I cannot help you find the page number.

4 CHAIRMAN BURG: Go ahead. Give me the three.

5 THE WITNESS: Fargo, and the next one would be Sioux  
6 City and Chapel Hill are the three.

7 BY MR. FELDSTEIN:

8 Q Can you give us the states on those?

9 A Fargo, North Dakota; Sioux City, South Dakota; and  
10 Chapel Hill, North Carolina.

11 Q Sioux City, Iowa, I believe?

12 A Yes, Iowa.

13 Q Can you identify for us in Fargo, the winner?

14 A Cablecom-General was awarded the franchise, and  
15 they are charging \$6.25 for their lowest tier of service.

16 Q Thus in Fargo, we have no free or very low priced  
17 service. We have a basic service. Of this, 25 in operation?

18 A This is correct. Of course, all of the applicants  
19 in Fargo were planning to charge for their basic tier. None of  
20 them were offering a service.

21 Q All right. Now, in Sioux City, who was the winner in  
22 Sioux City?

23 A Again, it was Cablecom-General. They charged \$5.50 for  
24 their basic tier. Again, none of the applicants have proposed  
25 to provide any free service.

Q The third one you mentioned was Chapel Hill, is that

1 correct?

2 A Yes.

3 Q Who was the winner in Chapel Hill?

4 A Village.

5 Q Does Village propose a free service?

6 A Yes, they do.

7 Q Of these three who are in operation, have any of them  
8 been in operation long enough to provide some information as to  
9 how their operation works?

10 A The only one that I could find any the hard data on  
11 was Chapel Hill, which has been marketing their service since  
12 June of 1980.

13 Q Review for me, please, according to the exhibit, what  
14 Chapel Hill was providing on its so-called basic tiers?

15 A What programming they were providing?

16 Q No, first, what number of channels and what prices they  
17 were.

18 A According to the exhibits in the first tier, they were  
19 offering 12 channels for free. The second tier, 21 channels  
20 charged at \$4.95. And on the third tier, 35 channels for \$7.95.

21 Q Now in terms of what you were able to learn about  
22 Chapel Hill, do you know what services are provided on these  
23 in terms of broadcast and nonbroadcast services?

24 A Yes. I was able to find out on the free tier, the  
25 Village Cable Company offered seven local broadcast signals,  
four access channels; one is leased, one is public, one is

1 government, and one is to the system, and one channel is devoted  
2 to a program guide.

3 Q How about on the next tier or tiers?

4 A I do not have a complete rundown of the entire program-  
5 ming, but they do carry one distant signal.

6 Q They do carry one distant signal on the next tier?

7 A Right.

8 Q Therefore, whatever other distant signals that they  
9 carry would be on the third?

10 A Right.

11 CHAIRMAN BURG: Excuse me for a moment. On the  
12 Fargo, North Dakota sheet, which company won the franchise?

13 THE WITNESS: Cablecome-General.

14 CHAIRMAN BURG: Thank you.

15 BY MR. FELDSTEIN:

16 Q Do we have any information as to, thus far, how many  
17 people are taking each tier in Chapel Hill?

18 A Yes, we do. The source of the information is September  
19 9, 1980, issue of Cable TV Regulations, which is the same  
20 newsletter that the exhibits were taken from. Since June of  
21 1980, we have had 660 subscribers who signed up for cable ser-  
22 vice in Chapel Hill. To date, 42 or six percent have taken only  
23 the free tier. 46 or seven percent are paying \$4.95, and 572  
24 or 87 percent are taking the \$7.95 package. This is somewhat  
25 different from what the cable company, Village, had planned in  
their marketing plan. They had thought that as many as ten

1 percent of their subscribers would take the free tier. And  
2 of course, they are finding that only six percent, to date, are  
3 taking the free tier.

4 Q Thus, have you figured in using those statistics,  
5 although there is a so-called free or universal service, what  
6 is the effective basic rate per subscriber in that system?

7 A If you calculate 42, count 42 who are taking the free  
8 tier, 46 at \$4.95, 572 at \$7.95, you come out with an effective  
9 rate of \$7.24 on a per subscriber basis in this system.

10 MR. ATTAWAY: Excuse me, Ms. Beales, would you repeat  
11 the 740--

12 THE WITNESS: \$7.24.

13 MR. ATTAWAY: Thank you.

14 BY MR. FELDSTEIN:

15 Q Now, Ms. Beales, we note that on the same chart that  
16 there are several paid services or paid cable tiers.

17 A This is Chapel Hill we are looking at?

18 Q Yes.

19 A Yes.

20 Q What services must a subscriber, basic service, take  
21 before he has an opportunity or an option to take one of these  
22 paid tiers?

23 A It is my understanding that you must take all services.

24 Q Thus, in other words, no subscriber who is getting a  
25 free or universal service can take pay unless he takes a \$7.95  
package of basic service?

1           A     That is correct. The reason behind this, which I  
2 think logically explains this process, is that the technology  
3 is not advanced enough so that if you take only the free tiers,  
4 the cable company has the opportunity to keep you from getting  
5 the other tiers if you take pay, tier one, being on this end  
6 and pay being on this end. There are two tiers in the middle ,  
7 and unless you take all three tiers and pay for those tiers, that  
8 is the only way the cable company can provide that.

9           Q     These are technical reasons?

10          A     Yes, they are technical reasons.

11          Q     In other words, you have to have the hardware in for  
12 the 35 channels before they can add the pay service?

13          A     That is correct.

14          Q     Ms. Beales, you have been able to identify, according  
15 to your testimony, no other on this chart operating system  
16 offering a free or universal service or even a very low-priced  
17 basic service in that regard?

18          A     That is correct.

19          Q     Are you familiar, at this point, with any other free  
20 services in the industry?

21          A     No, I'm not.

22          Q     In other words, if all of the systems that we are  
23 familiar with, including these franchise applications on this  
24 exhibit, the Copyright Owners Exhibit No. 10, we have only been  
25 able to identify 42 subscribers out of the approximately 17  
million cable television subscribers who are even ostensibly

1 obtaining free basic service?

2 A That is correct.

3 CHAIRMAN BURG: Mr. Feldstein, have you done this  
4 exercise for us in terms of the other stations in this  
5 exhibit, or are you just using Chapel Hill?

6 MR. FELDSTEIN: No. She has testified that there are  
7 only three that are in operation. The only one on which we have  
8 been able to obtain any data has been Chapel Hill. We  
9 believe that there is no data, and the other two systems, which  
10 are Cablecom systems, have just turned on.

11 CHAIRMAN BURG: And they offer no free.

12 MR. FELDSTEIN: Well, they offer low-price service and  
13 expanded service, but there is not enough data to be available  
14 to us. As we pointed out, many of these systems have been granted  
15 and contested, and so they have not begun building. Many of the  
16 others are still in a franchising mode.

17 BY MR. FELDSTEIN:

18 Q Now, Ms. Beales, turning to Exhibit No. 10A, the  
19 Television Fact Book from last year and a page from this year.  
20 Both of which showed a TV Systems, Inc. in Hawaii, in the Honolulu  
21 area, with a \$6 monthly charge last year and no monthly charge  
22 this year. Are you familiar with that exhibit?

23 A Yes, I am.

24 Q Have you attempted to verify the facts in Honolulu?

25 A Yes.



1 Q How have you done this?

2 A I spoke with the system manager, a gentleman named  
3 Lloyd F. Char. He is the president of TV Systems, Inc.

4 Q And what did Mr. Char tell you?

5 A Mr. Char was very surprised to hear that the 1980 fact  
6 book has listed his basic monthly fee as zero because he is  
7 actually charging for the service. It is an error on the part  
8 of the fact book.

9 Q When you spoke with him and incidentally you and I  
10 spoke with him. When we had this telephone conversation,  
11 Mr. Char did state, did he not, that he was charging \$6 for the  
12 basic service last year?

13 A That is correct.

14 Q Did he tell us what he is charging this year?

15 A Yes. He was able to secure a rather substantial rate  
16 increase during the interim period, and is now charging the  
17 urban Honolulu subscribers \$7.25 per month and the suburban  
18 Honolulu \$7.80 per month.

19 Q Mr. Char, thus, is giving away no free service.

20 A That is correct.

21 Q Mr. Char does not have the kind of tiering that we  
22 have seen in Exhibit No. 10?

23 A That is correct.

24 Q Mr. Char has a classic cable television system?

25 A That is correct.

Q This was simply an error in the Television Fact Book ?

1           A     That is correct.

2           MR. FELDSTEIN: May I substantiate that for the  
3 record with an exhibit. And I beg everyone's indulgence. When  
4 I handed out exhibit's the other day, I alluded to an Exhibit  
5 No. 13, which Mr. Attaway knows is an attempt to put the small  
6 system dollar limitation up. I have that printed as 13. And  
7 so I have listed this one 14. Would you like me to introduce  
8 13, or simply hand this in as 14?

9           CHAIRMAN BURG: Hand this in as 14.

10          (CO's Exhibit No. 14 was marked and received  
11 in evidence.)

12          BY MR. FELDSTEIN :

13          Q     For the record, Ms. Beales, would you read this  
14 document?

15          A     "Dated September 29, 1980, To Whom it May Concern:  
16 According to a conversation held with the counsel for NCTA, Mr.  
17 Stewart Feldstein, testimony was given before the Copyright  
18 Tribunal relative to the rates we charged to our subscribers  
19 for the basic cable service. The testimony given stated that  
20 the Television Fact Book previously showed our firm as charging  
21 \$6 for our basic service. And subsequently in 1979, no charge  
22 was being made to our subscribers. This information is not  
23 correct. In fact, our company charges our urban Honolulu  
24 subscribers \$7.25 per month and our suburban Honolulu subscribers  
25 \$7.80 per month." And it is signed by Lloyd F. Char of TV  
Systems, Inc.

1 Q Thank you. Now, Ms. Beales, we have stated that  
2 in the event a gap is found to exist between the rate of infla-  
3 tion and the amount by which the royalty fee per subscriber is  
4 risen in the period in question, that the provision of the  
5 Copyright Act providing for adjustments for DSE paying systems  
6 speaks in terms of the Tribunal being able to take into  
7 consideration extenuation factors. One of these extenuating  
8 factors, which is specifically mentioned, is a question of  
9 regulatory restraints?

10 A Yes.

11 Q Are you familiar with the Copyright Owner's Exhibit  
12 No. 9?

13 A Yes, I am.

14 Q Can you review for us what it was that the copyright  
15 owners attempted to establish by the use of that exhibit?

16 A The exhibit is titled, "Action on Rate Increase Request  
17 by Regulating Agencies," and its source cable television  
18 regulation newsletters from Paul Kagan, Associates. It only  
19 gives us percentages, no raw numbers. But for the six-month  
20 period, in groupings, averaged together between 1976 and  
21 January to June of 1980, it tells us the percent of requests  
22 for increase granted and percent granted of the amount requested.

23 Q Have you made any efforts to examine the basis of  
24 exhibit?

25 A Well, of course, we do not have the raw numbers here.  
So, we do not know--

1 Q Examined the derivation of how the exhibit came to  
2 be in terms of the data?

3 A Well, I have talked with John Mansell, the gentleman  
4 who puts together the information for the cable television  
5 regulation newsletters. He is the editor.

6 Q Can you tell the Tribunal about your conversation with  
7 Mr. Mansell and the limitations on this data which were discussed?

8 A Mr. Mansell gathers his information from newspaper  
9 clippings which he has sent to him or he finds or he learns  
10 about. So that his information, while often extensive, is  
11 variable. It's not a random sample, nor is it a review of the  
12 entire universe. It is whatever information he finds on cable  
13 systems.

14 The other important piece of information is that he  
15 bases most of his information on individual franchises and not  
16 on cable systems. So, a cable system may have one system in  
17 a town but be operating under many different jurisdictions. And  
18 in most cases he would report those separately. So, he reports,  
19 of course, a much higher number than there are systems. But  
20 sometimes, and I don't know exactly the reason for this, he  
21 lumps them together. So, in some cases they are franchises, and  
22 in some cases they are systems. It is hard to know, exactly,  
23 which one he is using in each case. Of course, we had looked  
24 at using his information early on, but because the Tribunal was  
25 sending their questionnaire to systems, we thought that that was  
perhaps a better measure of what is happening in the industry

1 rather than by franchise basis.

2 Q In other words, the data is collected neither from  
3 a random sample or from the entire universe?

4 A That's correct.

5 Q The data is verified only by what appears in the  
6 newspaper?

7 A That is correct.

8 Q The data includes rate increases on franchises or  
9 systems?

10 A Correct.

11 Q A system sometimes includes more than one franchise?

12 A Correct.

13 Q Thus, it is a mixture of data?

14 A That is correct.

15 Q Thus, the statistical reliability of this data by these  
16 limitations, which Mr. Mansell has conversed with you about,  
17 calls into question the total reliability of this data?

18 A Yes.

19 CHAIRMAN BURG: We will have a two-minute recess.

20 (A brief recess was taken.)

21 BY MR. FELDSTEIN:

22 Q Ms. Beales, have you been able to tabulate the CRT's  
23 survey responses?

24 A Yes, I have.

25 Q Could you please tell us what you have found?

A You will refer to Chart No. 10. This is a tabulation

1 of the DSE system's responses to the CRT's survey. On question  
2 No. 8, it says, "Ask only of the systems that were regulated."  
3 We started with 350 systems in this category at the time we  
4 tabulated our responses. We found that the systems reported  
5 an average rate at the time they went in for a request. And  
6 incidentally, it should be noted that some systems included more  
7 than one rate increase on the form and others did not. This  
8 counts for the total number of rate increases that were  
9 recorded.

10 We started from \$6.74. The average amount requested  
11 for this sample is 96 cents. The average amount granted was  
12 88 cents, which is 92 percent of the amount that was requested.  
13 19 percent were granted an amount which is less than requested.  
14 That is the basic information. I should also point out that  
15 this figure includes the systems that were pending. There were  
16 65 systems that were pending at the time as of April 1, 1980.  
17 We chose to include these because we felt they should be  
18 counted. A number of them had been pending since 1978. It  
19 seemed logical to include them, that they were getting less than  
20 they were requesting because of the long time lag involved.  
21 If those pendings were not included, this number would be 14  
22 percent.

22 BY MR. FELDSTEIN:

23 Q All right. Now, that is the data on the increases.  
24 At the bottom of that chart you have something called "time lag"?

25 A That is correct. We calculated the average time that

1. elapsed between the date of a request for a rate increase and  
2. the dates that the regulatory body acted or made the rate  
3. increase effective. If a cable system reported on their form  
4. the City Council decided on July 1 that we could have a rate  
5. increase, but we could not implement it until August 1. August  
6. 1 was the date that was counted.

7. This information is based on a total response of  
8. 308. Of this sample, 257 or 83 percent experienced some kind  
9. of a lag. This is a conservative estimate. We counted all  
10. months as a four-week period. And hence, for the entire year,  
11. it would be counted as only 48 weeks. We came up with a result  
12. of an average time lag of 13.9 weeks for all systems which  
13. translates into 3.5 months.

14. MR. ATTAWAY: Excuse me. You gave a number 308.  
15. What was the number after that?

16. THE WITNESS: 308 is the number of responses to this  
17. particular question.

18. MR. ATTAWAY: What was the number after that?

19. THE WITNESS: I said that 257 or 83 percent experienced  
20. a time lag.

21. MR. ATTAWAY: Thank you.

22. BY MR. FELDSTEIN:

23. Q Now, this is for systems, obviously, that have had  
24. action?

25. A That is correct.

Q Thus, it does not include those who are still pending

1 because we have not been able to conclude a front and a back;  
2 is that correct?

3 A Yes.

4 Q Now, does this data on rate increases include any  
5 information on how much time the President's regulation caused  
6 a cable system to delay its request?

7 A No. The only question on the questionnaire sent out  
8 by the Tribunal that got at that was the importance of regulation  
9 in delaying rate increases was the time lag question which was  
10 measuring the time between the actual date of request and the  
11 time action was taken.

12 Q Have you attempted to further corroborate and expand  
13 on the data that CRT's survey produced?

14 A Yes. In our conversations with cable operators, we  
15 found that there is a much larger time lag involved in getting  
16 a rate increase. It is impossible to decide I need a rate  
17 increase and run across the street to your regulatory body and  
18 hope they are meeting that day and say "Yes, I need a rate  
19 increase," and they would grant it that day so that  
20 we found that there was much longer time lag needed to be  
21 identified.

22 Since we undertook a very similar survey as the Tri-  
23 bunal but added questions that attempted to document this  
24 longer time lag factor, we conducted our survey using a modi-  
25 fied version of the Tribunal's questionnaire. We conducted it  
only of large systems, systems that had subscriber counts of



1. over 5,000 as listed in the 1979 TV Fact Book. There were  
2 718 of those systems reported. We sent surveys to 241. They  
3 were randomly selected from the total universe.

4 Q Which exhibit number are we now looking at?

5 A Exhibit No. 11.

6 Q Thank you.

7 A We had completed questionnaires from 191 of the  
8 systems which is 27 percent of the universe. The results were  
9 remarkably similar to the Tribunal in virtually every question  
10 in terms of the percentages that responded, the rate increase  
11 data. It was very similar.

12 We report in Chart No. 11 the responses to the same  
13 questions that we had shown in No. 10. The average rate at the  
14 time of request is based on, incidentally, 128 responses to  
15 this question. These are all regulated systems. The average  
16 amount requested was \$1.90. The average amount granted was  
17 94 cents. 21 percent were granted an amount less than  
18 requested.

19 In terms of time lag, we found a slightly longer time  
20 lag. 17 weeks was the average elapsed from the date of request  
21 for increase to the date of action or effective date. This  
22 translates into 4.3 months.

23 Q You stated a moment ago that in addition to this  
24 formal lag, date of request to date of action or date of  
25 effect, that the presence of regulation caused a further  
time lag?

1 A That is correct.

2 Q Have you been able to quantify that?

3 A Yes. On Chart No. 12, we have responses to the  
4 question of the increase time lag. What we were trying to  
5 measure was the time that it would elapse between when a system  
6 decided internally they needed a rate increase, and they took  
7 the first internal step toward achieving that rate increase.  
8 That was the first period we measured.

9 The next period we measured was from the time when  
10 the system had taken the internal step to the time when they  
11 went to their regulatory body and made a formal request for a  
12 rate increase. Now, in this Chart No. 12, we have mixed our  
13 two sources. We started with the information that you saw  
14 from Chart No. 10. The time elapsed from the date  
15 of request for increase to date action effective.

16 We will utilize the responses to the CRT survey, which  
17 is a more conservative number, 3.5 months on the average. The  
18 next line tells us the time elapsed when the systems forecast  
19 a need for a rate increase to the first formalized internal  
20 business step based on NCTA's survey whose average was 4.6  
21 months.

22 CHAIRMAN BURG: Explain that, please.

23 THE WITNESS: The system manager looks at his books  
24 and says I need a rate increase, and he then begins to take  
25 internal steps to determine if this is a good time, if it's  
an election year, if he should go to his City Council now to

1 get a rate increase. It was asked by the actual questionnaire  
2 how much time elapsed between the time you forecasts a need for a  
3 rate increase. and you take your first formalized internal  
4 business step.

5 BY MR. FELDSTEIN:

6 Q In other words, if there was no regulation or there  
7 were no inhibitions, are you saying that once they determined  
8 they would need a rate increase in the absence of regulation,  
9 it would simply be implemented?

10 A That is correct.

11 Q Thus, the presence of regulation is what causes this  
12 4.6 months to occur?

13 A That is correct.

14 CHAIRMAN BURG: You are talking about the first  
15 formalized internal business step. Now, if you were saying  
16 external business step, that is the confusion right now. It  
17 seems there is a great time lag internally before you even go  
18 to that regulating body.

19 THE WITNESS: That is correct.

20 CHAIRMAN BURG: What is responsible for that time lag  
21 internally?

22 THE WITNESS: Determining the political climate as  
23 to whether it is worth the effort to go and seek a rate increase.  
24 We have talked to many cable operators, and I believe there will  
25 be some witnesses to follow me who can document this better on  
a system-by-system basis. In every case it appears to be

1 different. It ranges from going to talk to your City Council  
2 and finding out if they are even willing to consider giving you  
3 a rate increase. If they are not, it's not worth your time.

4 CHAIRMAN BURG: There are internal applications to that  
5 also?

6 THE WITNESS: Yes. We did, however on the questionnaire  
7 say internal business steps.

8 MR. FELDSTEIN: I would also point out that that is  
9 an excellent question in that regard. The NCTA survey simply  
10 asked the question. We have a quantified result. We will be  
11 presenting industry witnesses who will be able to tell you how,  
12 in a large company, they arrived at these decisions to go or not  
13 go for a rate increase for how much.

14 CHAIRMAN BURG: You understand the way I was approaching  
15 it it seems they were asleep at the switch, and we are doddling  
16 today to be conservative.

17 THE WITNESSSS: The next question we asked was the time  
18 elapsed between the formalized internal business step to the  
19 time you actually go for petition to get the rate increase.  
20 This averaged out to be 2.9 months.

21 I must emphasize as a researcher, we are not attempting  
22 to stand here and say that for all of our industry it takes 11  
23 months on the average to get a rate increase. But for a signifi-  
24 cant number of systems, there is a regulatory lag factor which  
25 is definitely present and affects their ability to get rate  
increases.

1. BY MR. FELDSTEIN:

2 Q You have previously attempted to establish the  
3 presence of a regulatory cap on the rates themselves; is that  
4 correct?

5 A Yes.

6 Q And in this aspect, are you attempting to establish  
7 an addition to the cap?

8 A Yes.

9 Q There is also a delay factor?

10 A That is correct.

11 Q Again, can you tell us the size of the universe which  
12 was involved in this data?

13 A Yes. On Exhibit No. 12, on the copies we have passed  
14 out--Of course, the CRT survey was based on a total of 308  
15 responses. The NCTA survey, we had 88 responses to this first  
16 step; and we had 92 responses to the second step. Not every  
17 company, obviously, has both kinds of problems. It is very  
18 individualized. This is an attempt to get some kind of a  
19 reading of how many systems are affected.

20 Q These are systems, not companies?

21 A Systems. Yes, individual systems.

22 Q You have testified that the time lag conservatively  
23 may be 11 months. Could you put this into perspective in terms  
24 of the time period that this Tribunal is concerned with?

25 A We are measuring from October of 1976 to April 1 of  
1980 is the time period for the data.

1 Q That would be 41½ months, is that correct? Thus,  
2 we are talking about a delay of 11 months.

3 A That is correct.

4 Q In a time period of 41½ months. Finally, we get to  
5 the missing Exhibit No. 13. Now, Ms. Beales, our Exhibit No.  
6 13, we have been discussing, up until now, the adjustment to be  
7 made to the royalty rates for those systems who pay on a DSE  
8 equivalent?

9 A That is correct.

10 Q The second adjustment which this Tribunal must make  
11 is of the dollar limitation for those systems who enjoy the  
12 small system limitation exemption, I believe it is called.  
13 Assuming as I stated in my opening statement that the language  
14 of the act to maintain the constant dollar level of the dollar  
15 limitation is observed, how would this work in practicing?

16 A Well, we have an example in Chart No. 13, taking the  
17 exemption dollar limits, the 40,000. These are a semiannual  
18 category, 40 to 80 and 80 to 160. And adjusting them by the  
19 amount of inflation that has occurred in the period. This is  
20 just an example of what can be done. In this particular case,  
21 we used 30 percent. The PCE deflator is increased by 30.6  
22 percent. We increased the dollar limit by 30 percent.

23 Q In other words, this would be, in across the board,  
24 raising of the dollar limits which would have the effect of  
25 placing those systems who have outgrown the dollar systems  
back into the limits?

1 A That is correct.

2 Q Now, you have used these categories. Is this because  
3 of those dollar categories on the left-hand column subtract  
4 the dollar categories in the Act?

5 A Yes.

6 Q Thank you.

7 MR. FELDSTEIN: Madam Chairman, that concludes our  
8 direct case for Ms. Beales. We have other witnesses.

9 CHAIRMAN BURG: Yes, I understand that. Mr. Attaway?

10 CROSS EXAMINATION

11 BY MR. ATTAWAY:

12 Q Ms. Beales, I would like to compliment you on your  
13 professional testimony. It was a very good presentation.

14 A Thank you.

15 Q Rather than going through your testimony sequentially  
16 and starting with your testimony which you gave days ago,  
17 what I would like to do is start back with this morning's  
18 first. Then we will go back to the testimony you gave the  
19 other day. Let's start with regulatory restraint? I believe  
20 that was your Chart Ten.

21 Now Ms. Beales, you were critical of our exhibit  
22 including the data from the Kagan Newsletter. You did not  
23 mention our other exhibit showing the results of the CRT survey.  
24 May I assume that you found that to be substantially correct,  
25 a correct reflection of the industry as it exists?

A Obviously, I have not seen the data that was analyzed.

1. You had many more systems. I don't know your precise  
2 methodology, but I did not criticize it.

3 Q You have no criticism of it. Thank you. On your  
4 Exhibit No. 10, I have a great deal of difficulty with this.

5 CHAIRMAN BURG: Excuse me one moment, Mr. Attaway.  
6 Ms. Beales, could you put your larger chart back, please?

7 THE WITNESS: Sure.

8 CHAIRMAN BURG: Thank you.

9 BY MR. ATTAWAY:

10 Q I had a great deal of difficulty to try to reconcile  
11 these numbers. I understand the 96 cents, and I understand the  
12 88 cents. When I got to the 19 percent, I was totally con-  
13 fused. Now, I think I understand why the 88 cents is what was  
14 granted out of what was requested, right?

15 A That is correct.

16 Q 88 cents is 92 percent of 96 cents, right?

17 A That is correct.

18 Q So, on the average, the cable systems got 92 percent  
19 of what they asked for?

20 A Based on this, yes.

21 Q Based on this survey. Now, moving to the 19 percent,  
22 I thought that was to reflect the percent that they did not  
23 get. That is not really true. They did not get 8 percent of  
24 what they asked for, right? If they got 92 percent, they did  
25 not get 8 percent.

A Right.



1 Q The 19 percent has no relationship to the previous two  
2 numbers?

3 A Well, it has a relationship in that it utilizes the  
4 same data, but you are right. No, it does not. It is measuring  
5 something different.

6 Q It's apples, apples, and peanuts?

7 (There was general laughter.)

8 A Yes, what it measures in the percented systems. They  
9 were granted an amount less than that requested.

10 Q But you don't know what that amount is? Excuse me,  
11 that amount would be 8 percent on the average, right?

12 A On the average. There were cases, of course, where  
13 they got nothing. There were cases where they got 16 percent  
14 on the average. They got 88 cents. And in 98 percent of the  
15 cases, they got an amount less than what they were asking for.

16 Q Footnote two chart says that the data was based on  
17 350 responses. In Chart No. 7, you said that you tabulated 551  
18 CRT responses?

19 A That is correct.

20 Q Why did you exclude the missing 201 responses?

21 A Well, in question number 8, the form directed a system  
22 only to fill out this section if they were regulated. That  
23 excluded a large number of systems from even filling out question  
24 8. We did have some cases that excluded in addition to that  
25 because they did not fill out all of the questions that were  
necessary to tabulate. They would tell you the date of the

1 first action, but they would not tell you the time when the  
2 City Council acted on it.

3 Q Thank you. So, this survey only includes that  
4 portion of the industry that is regulated?

5 A That is correct. That was the instruction on the  
6 form.

7 Q I would like to point out that 201 systems that were  
8 responses , that were not included, not reflected in this chart  
9 equal 36.5 percent of the total 551 responses in Chart No. 7.  
10 That is a substantial percentage.

11 A That was not a question.

12 Q It was a question. No, I'm sorry. It was not. You  
13 are right. So, this chart certainly does not reflect the  
14 entire cable industry?

15 A That is true. But it does reflect the regulated  
16 portion of the industry which is, of course, the majority.

17 Q Does the reflected system ask for an increase?

18 A Yes. If they reported in Question No. 8--No. They  
19 only filled it out if they asked for an increase. And there  
20 are, as I have pointed out, many systems that thought the  
21 direction was to include every rate increase that they had in  
22 the period. So, they showed two, three, four; and they would  
23 try to right them in and so on.

24 There were others that only included one. So, you  
25 could not tell from the data that it was every single rate  
increase for every single system. Obviously, systems

1 interpreted the questionnaire differently.

2 Q In addition to unregulated systems, systems that did  
3 not reflect an increase, are not reflected in this chart?

4 A That is correct.

5 Q You mentioned some responses included more than one  
6 request, were they counted once or twice?

7 A They were counted for every request.

8 Q For every one?

9 A Yes. There were 350 separate rate requests that were  
10 counted. For the 350 figure that I listed as my base, that  
11 was all of the requests that were included if they gave complete  
12 information as to when they requested it and when it was acted  
13 on, and so on.

14 Q If a system made one request and got less than what  
15 they asked and made a subsequent request and didn't get what they  
16 asked, that would be counted twice. The first one would show  
17 a grant of less than that which was requested?

18 A Right. Because we were dealing with such a long period  
19 of time, four years, there are a number of systems who asked for  
20 a rate increase more than once. We felt that that was what the  
21 Tribunal was trying to find out.

22 Q All right. Let's move to Chart No. 11? For the  
23 Tribunal, would you put that on the easel, please? I believe  
24 you stated that of the total systems sent your NCTA survey  
25 questionnaire, only 27 percent responded?

A No. What I told you was that there are 718 systems

1 listed in the fact book with subscribers of more than 5,000.  
2 That was our universe. We drew a random sample of that which  
3 was 241 systems. We had 191 send us completed information.

4 The 27 percent indicates that 191, it is 27 percent  
5 of the entire universe that we tried to measure.

6 Q All right. What percent of those sent questionnaires  
7 responded?

8 A 79 percent.

9 Q Did you make any attempt to determine why the 21  
10 percent that did not respond failed to do so?

11 A Yes. We, in fact, conducted a phone follow-up on  
12 the systems that had not responded which increased our response  
13 rate. We found three unusable forms, seven systems refused to  
14 participate. We telephoned 22, and they said they would respond,  
15 and they never did, or not by our cut-off time. Eight had  
16 busy signals. Ten had no answers.

17 Q Could it be that those systems which did not respond  
18 did not do so because they experienced no time lag and did not  
19 think they would be helping the NCTA?

20 A I have no idea why they did not respond. I can tell  
21 you I conducted a number of other surveys for NCTA. On the  
22 average, we get about a 33 percent return rate. So, I thought  
23 we were extremely fortunate to get 79 percent, as was the  
24 Tribunal to get 50 percent of the entire universe to respond.  
25 The FCC gets something like 80 percent.

CHAIRMAN BURG: Mr. Attaway, would you indulge me?

1 MR. ATTAWAY: All right.

2 CHAIRMAN BURG: I understand, Ms. Beales, the universe.  
3 And you took a random sample?

4 THE WITNESS: That's right. 241 was selected.

5 CHAIRMAN BURG: On Chart No. 11, why is your second  
6 footnote based on 128 responses for the average at the time  
7 of request?

8 THE WITNESS: Because we used the same form that you  
9 had sent out or a modified version. So, this question was only  
10 asked of those systems that were regulated and had asked for  
11 a rate increase during the period. It was the same instruction  
12 that you included. So the two charts that we have just looked  
13 at, 10 and 11, are comparable on this question.

14 CHAIRMAN BURG: Thank you.

15 MR. ATTAWAY: Thank you, Madam Chairman.

16 BY MR. ATTAWAY:

17 Q This chart, also, only reflects regulated systems?

18 A That is correct.

19 Q What time period was covered by this survey?

20 A The questions were asked from October 19, 1976, the  
21 start of the period to April 1, 1980, the end of the period,  
22 the same as the Tribunals.

23 Q Were the cable systems you surveyed told the purpose  
24 of this survey?

25 A I have a copy of the questionnaire and letter that

1 accompanied it if you would like that submitted into the  
2 record. They were told that we were conducting a follow-up  
3 survey, and that they may have already filled out a form for the  
4 Tribunal. They could perhaps rely on the same information  
5 if they had already gathered it together.

6 Q I would like you to submit that cover letter into  
7 the record. They were told--and the questionnaire--excuse me.  
8 They were advised that this was for purposes of the CRT  
9 proceedings?

10 A Yes. It may take me a second to find it.

11 MR. FELDSTEIN: You can find it, and we can submit  
12 it after lunch?

13 THE WITNESS: If that is acceptable.

14 MR. FELDSTEIN: We have to make copies. Is that all  
15 right?

16 MR. ATTAWAY: All right. Ms. Beales, I may want to  
17 ask some questions on it once I have seen it.

18 THE WITNESS: All right.

19 BY MR. ATTAWAY:

20 Q Now, let's turn to Chart No. 12. Does this chart  
21 also reflect only those systems that were regulated and that  
22 asked for a rate increase during the relevant time period?

23 A This reflects an added-on page which was asked of  
24 all systems. The question was, and I will read it into the  
25 record, "In an attempt to quantify the total time required to  
gain a rate increase between October 19, 1976, April 1, 1980,

1 please tell us (A) The amount of time in months between  
2 forecasting the need for a rate increase and the first formalized  
3 internal business step? (B) The amount of time in months  
4 between taking the first formalized internal business step and  
5 your formal petition for a rate increase to your regulatory  
6 body?"

7 This page was also entitled "Oops We Goofed." We  
8 forgot to add that in.

9 Q Didn't you say the universal systems-- to which you sent  
10 the questionnaire--only included regulated systems?

11 A No. The universe included all systems. The universe  
12 was all systems with more than 5,000 subscribers of which we  
13 took a random survey and a sampling of 241.

14 Q If the system was not regulated, would it have  
15 responded to this question?

16 A To this question, the system could have responded.  
17 Yes.

18 Q How many did?

19 A I did not tabulate that.

20 Q Is it reflected on this chart?

21 A All systems that responded are reflected in this  
22 chart. What we were attempting to do with this chart was not  
23 to tell you that every system experiences all of these problems,  
24 but only give you an indication that for some portion of our  
25 industry, which is very hard to quantify, there is a problem.  
It takes a long time. That is what we were attempting to use

1 this for. That is what these numbers reflect. As you can see,  
2 of course, we have used one source for one number and another  
3 source for another number. We are not trying to say this is all  
4 from the same survey.

5 Q The largest period of delay is 4.6 months. The reason  
6 for that was the period needed to forecast the need for an  
7 increase and the first formalized internal business step.  
8 Wouldn't an unregulated system have to do the same thing?  
9 Doesn't an unregulated system have to determine whether they  
10 needed a rate increase or not and institute whatever procedures  
11 a cable system would institute to achieve a rate increase,  
12 notify subscribers and so forth?

13 A That is correct. We could retabulate this information  
14 based on regulated and unregulated because, of course, we have  
15 an indication. It was clear--I can tell you from looking  
16 at the surveys, that the unrelated systems would say we are  
17 not regulated. We don't fill this out.

18 However, I did not tabulate that way so I cannot tell  
19 you in every case or give you the percentages.

20 Q This is not a factor that relates to only regulated  
21 systems. It also relates to unregulated systems?

22 A It could.

23 Q But, yet, you are calling it regulatory restraints?

24 A That is correct. One important point to keep  
25 in mind, and this is something that you will be hearing much  
more detail about from some of our other witnesses, is that the



1 term "unregulated or deregulated" is very difficult for a  
2 cable system. It is not consistently utilized by cable systems.  
3 We found in analyzing the results of the Tribunal survey that  
4 systems classified themselves as deregulated if their City  
5 Council had told them; for example, you are deregulated. You  
6 can go in and ask for a rate increase but you can only get 60  
7 percent of the CPI; or you are deregulated and you can increase  
8 your rate anytime you want. And the system right next to yours  
9 in the geographical boarder area is still regulated. There  
10 rates are X. Hence, your subscribers will not continue to buy  
11 your services because the rates are different from the next  
12 geographical area.

13 There are a lot of definitional problems with what is  
14 regulated. Another example--and we saw this frequently on  
15 the Tribunal's forms. We are a deregulated system and we can  
16 go in according to our City Council and raise our rates up to  
17 five percent any time we want, but only once a year.

18 So, it is hard to know what that definition is. It  
19 was clear from the forms that different systems interpreted  
20 it differently.

21 Q Could we get back to my line of questioning, please?

22 A Sure.

23 Q I am trying to establish here--certainly, the second  
24 factor relating to time lag, is experienced by all systems.  
25 I think the third factor is as well. After an unregulated  
system has determined it needs a rate increase, it also has to

1 take time to send out notices to subscribers that there will  
2 be a rate increase which, I think, is a good business practice  
3 that is probably followed by most systems.

4 So, the third factor, as well , is probably experienced  
5 by unregulated sytems. I don't see how you can say that the  
6 second and third factors are matters of regulatory restraint.  
7 They are matters of doing business of operating a cable  
8 television system without regard to whether they are regulated  
9 or not?

10 A No. If I may read the question again, I think that  
11 that will clarify the point. Point B was asking the system  
12 to tell us the amount of time in months between taking the  
13 first formalized internal business step and your formal petition  
14 for a rate increase to your regulatory body. That includes  
15 the regulated systems. This does not include systems who are  
16 only notifying their subscribers the questions specifically  
17 asked to your regulatory body.

18 Q Well, if a system was unregulated, it probably would  
19 not answer that question.

20 A That is correct.

21 Q Then it would not be reflected in this chart.

22 A That is correct.

23 Q Didn't you say earlier that unregulated systems were  
24 reflected in the chart?

25 A I said this question was asked of everyone. In general,  
unregulated systems who classified themselves as deregulated,

1 did not fill out this page. And would not have filled out that  
2 particular question because it asked only of the regulatory  
3 body.

4 Q Well, I would like to repeat my question which is  
5 not specifically related to your questionnaire. Is it  
6 not true that the second and third factor listed on that chart  
7 would relate to unregulated systems as well as regulated  
8 systems?

9 A They could.

10 Q Thank you. Ms. Beales, rather than going to Chart  
11 No. 13, I would like to leave that for the end of my cross  
12 examination and now go back to your testimony of two days  
13 ago.

14 In your testimony, you mentioned a number of  
15 factors that you feel that this Tribunal should consider in  
16 reaching its decision, four factors to be specific. I  
17 would like to turn to Chart No. 1 which is the specific  
18 statutory provision under which we are all operating.

19 A Chart No. 1?

20 Q Yes, ma'am.

21 A Would you hike that up?

22 Q Yes, please. It might be easier to follow. If  
23 you would look at the Subsection A, what are the two factors  
24 that are to be reflected in the Tribunal's decision?

25 A One, the rates established by May be adjusted to  
reflect one national monetary inflation or deflation, or two,

1 changes in the average rates charged cable subscribers for the  
2 basic service of providing secondary transmission.

3 Q Thank you. Is there any mention there about DSE's?

4 A No.

5 Q Is there any mention about growth of systems into a  
6 higher DSE payment category?

7 A No.

8 Q Isn't it quite specific that these are two, and only two  
9 factors to be reflected in this decision?

10 A I believe if you continue on in the sentence--

11 Q Ms. Beales, I did not ask you what the purpose of  
12 the revision was. I asked you what two factors are to be  
13 reflected in the decision?

14 A I am not a lawyer: I have just read this to you.

15 Q Are you familiar with the CRT questionnaire that was sent  
16 out earlier this year?

17 A Yes.

18 Q I would like to quote from that questionnaire which  
19 has been introduced in the record of this proceeding. First  
20 paragraph: "The purpose of this review and any adjustments  
21 of royalty rates that may result is to assure that the value  
22 of the royalty fees paid by cable systems is not eroded by  
23 changes in the value dollar or changes in average rates  
24 charged cable subscribers."

25 Now, there are a number of questions in the question-  
naire 11. Were you afforded an opportunity to examine

1 this questionnaire before it was sent out?

2 A I believe that NCTA looked at it.

3 Q Did you make any suggestions?

4 A I believe that some suggestions were made. I personally  
5 did not make them.

6 Q You understand that some suggestions were made to  
7 include or exclude questions that related to the purpose of  
8 this proceeding?

9 A I understand that NCTA, yes, suggested some changes.  
10 I do not know what they were nor do I know if they were  
11 adopted.

12 Q Are there any questions in this questionnaire that  
13 related to the addition of the signals or addition of  
14 DSE's?

15 A No, not that I know of.

16 Q Are there any questions in this questionnaire that  
17 relate to movement of cable systems into the DSE category?

18 A No.

19 Q At the time NCTA reviewed this questionnaire did  
20 NCTA, anyone at NCTA, to your knowledge, feel that these  
21 factors were relevant?

22 A I have no idea. I did not review it personally.  
23 So, I can not speak to that question.

24 Q You did not want to assume if someone--

25 MR. FELDSTEIN: I object to this line of questioning.  
The witness has stated already that she had no part in the

1 in the process. It is not only a question of hearsay. It is  
2 a question of her having no knowledge of it. She testified  
3 she was not involved in the questionnaire review.

4 MR. ATTAWAY: I will withdraw the question.

5 BY MR. ATTAWAY:

6 Q Let's turn now to Chart No. 3, please. In your  
7 testimony, I believe you made it abundantly clear, as in fact,  
8 this chart and the House Report does state that the numbers  
9 listed here were estimates; isn't that correct?

10 A That is correct.

11 Q It is also clear, is it not, that they were estimates  
12 supplied to Congress, not estimates made by Congress?

13 A That is correct. Although, they were clearly accepted  
14 by Congress because it was put in their report.

15 Q Do you know for a fact that they were accepted by  
16 Congress as reflecting the state of the industry during  
17 or could it be that they were accepted by Congress for whatever  
18 their value because they were the only estimates that  
19 existed--

20 COMMISSIONER BRENNAN: Could you modify your question  
21 and say "accepted by the House of Representatives"?

22 (There was general laughter.)

23 MR. ATTAWAY: You are absolutely correct; Commissioner  
24 Brennan. By the House of Representatives.

25 THE WITNESS: I believe I testified on Tuesday that  
I was not involved in this process, and I do not know the

1 the specific circumstances.

2 BY MR. ATTAWAY:

3 Q You don't know if they were actually accepted at their  
4 face value. I believe you also mentioned in your testimony  
5 that these estimates were probably taken from the 1976 fact  
6 book?

7 A The estimated number of subscribers utilized was  
8 10.8 million subscribers. The 1976 fact book, at the time  
9 back in 1976, had estimated 10.8 million subscribers and later  
10 changed that to their hard actual projection of the number of  
11 subscribers at the time. It could be a great coincidence that  
12 these two numbers matched. It would appear that someone may  
13 have consulted the fact book.

14 Q Having been involved in the process at the time, I  
15 think you are quite accurate in stating that these numbers  
16 probably came from the fact book. Are you familiar with  
17 the fact book and how the data in the fact book is selected?

18 A Somewhat.

19 Q Are you familiar specifically with the time lag  
20 between the time data is submitted to the fact book and the  
21 time that it is published?

22 A Not specifically in every case. I would assume there  
23 would be some time lag for printing and so on.

24 Q In the 1976 fact book, it states that the reporting  
25 dates for most systems are mid March--1975. It also states  
that some of the information contained in the fact book is

1 much older. It cites FCC 325 information ending December 31,  
2 1973. On the basis of your experience in using the fact book,  
3 I assume you do, do you regard the information contained in  
4 this fact book as being up to date?

5 A For many systems it is. Many systems do not change  
6 their subscribers.

7 Q It is up to date for systems that don't change their  
8 subscribers?

9 A I think that would be accurate. Yes.

10 Q If, in fact, Congress did use the 1976 fact book in  
11 reaching it's estimate of 10.8 million subscribers in 1976,  
12 is it not fair to say that that estimate was probably consider-  
13 ably in error as a result of delay in reporting this information  
14 by the fact book?

15 A I would assume that. Many systems may not have changed  
16 their subscribers from 1973. Hence, they did not change the num-  
17 ber reported in the fact book. I don't think there is any  
18 way for me to determine that that is an error.

19 Q Even if one would assume that this information in this  
20 fact book was absolutely 100 percent up to date on the day  
21 that this was published, it would only reflect the cable  
22 television industry as it existed on January 1, 1976?

23 A That is the date they used for their source. Yes,  
24 that is correct.

25 Q Not the entire year?

A No, not the entire year. Of course, the subscribers



1 probably increased by the time the Act was passed using their  
2 month projections. It looks like it is probably 11.6 million  
3 which would make the royalty fee per subscriber, of course,  
4 even lower, and hence, our increase even greater over the period.

5 Q You are straying from answering my question. I wish  
6 you would try to refrain from doing that.

7 A I'll try.

8 Q Ms. Beales, so we can be sure that we have a complete  
9 record for the record, would you read this paragraph out of the  
10 1976 Fact Book, please?

11 A Certainly. The whole page is entitled, "Directory  
12 of Cable CATV Systems." And the section is entitled, "Subscriber  
13 Counts." "Computation of subscribers is based on FCC formula  
14 wherein: (1) The total individual dwelling subscribers are  
15 added to two. Total revenues from both rate subscribers (such  
16 as motels) divided by rate of individual dwelling units."

17 Do you also want me to read the note?

18 Q Yes, if you will.

19 A Note: "Total U. S. subscribers reported in this  
20 directory is 9,995, 115. Reports from systems are of varying  
21 dates. The reporting dates for systems are mid March 1976, and  
22 the forgoing total is as of that date. Television Fact Book  
23 estimates the total as of January 1, 1975, at 9.8 million, as  
24 of September 1, 1975, 10.45 million."

25 Q Thank you. Staying with the fact book, I believe you  
mentioned today that you checked on a representation we made  
in our direct testimony with respect to the listing in the

*Accurate Reporting Co., Inc.*

1 fact book for Honolulu, Hawaii and found that to be an error?

2 A That is correct.

3 Q Is it not true that errors are often found in the  
4 fact book?

5 A I think we all make errors.

6 Q To specifically answer my last question, is it true,  
7 as you in fact demonstrated today, that there are errors in the  
8 fact book?

9 A We found an error in the listing in the Honolulu  
10 system.

11 Q Thank you. Since the 1976 Fact Book contains data  
12 collected in 1975, in making your calculation on some of the  
13 subsequent charts, many of the subsequent charts, why did you  
14 use the 1976 Fact Book?

15 Why didn't you use the '77 Fact Book or '78 Fact Book  
16 to obtain data that related to the period in question which  
17 was October 19, 1976?

18 A I utilized the 1976 Fact Book because based on the  
19 worksheets in NCTA's files, it was the source of the calculations  
20 that NCTA prepared to present.

21 Q So, what these charts reflects is the cable industry  
22 as it existed in 1976 by the cable industry as reflected in  
23 the 1976 Fact Book?

24 A That is correct. The total number of subscribers,  
25 of course, which was an estimate at that time was later changed  
by the fact book as to this number of how many subscribers

1 existed in 1976.

2 COMMISSIONER JAMES: Out of courtesy, in the fact book,  
3 if you have a hotel, is that considered one subscriber, or  
4 if it is 100 rooms, is it 100 subscribers? Does the witness  
5 know?

6 THE WITNESS: As we just read from that, you take  
7 total revenues and divide by--I'm sorry. I don't really know  
8 how it was worded. You take total revenues from the bulk  
9 rate of subscribers motel, divide by individual dwelling units--  
10 is the direction listed?

11 COMMISSIONER JAMES: That does not answer my question.  
12 If you have Marriot that has 200 rooms in it, is that 200  
13 subscribers or one subscriber from what you are reading there?

14 THE WITNESS: You take the total revenues from bulk  
15 rate subscribers, divide by rate of individual dwelling units.  
16 I would interpret that if you got \$100 from you motel--I don't  
17 know how I would interpret it actually. That is what they are  
18 directed to do. In conversations with some people, the  
19 fact book, and with some of our cable systems, I have learned  
20 many of them do not understand that phrase very well. They  
21 put their total first set subscribers down.

22 COMMISSIONER JAMES: Say the last part again?

23 THE WITNESS: I have talked with some. I don't claim  
24 it to be a representative sample. They don't understand it  
25 very well. They report to the fact book their total  
first set subscribers.

1 Q Would that include in my example if they had a hotel  
2 with 200?

3 A They might not count it.

4 Q Thank you.

5 BY MR. ATTAWAY:

6 Q When you computed the subscriber counts in the  
7 1976 Fact Book for DSE systems and smaller systems, how did you  
8 handle commercial subscribers, hotels, motels, apartment  
9 buildings and so forth?

10 A I did not do any separate calculations for them.

11 Q In fact, there is no way of knowing that information  
12 from the fact book?

13 A I did not find a way to do it.

14 Q When you calculated DSE's for DSE systems from the  
15 1976 Fact Book--

16 A I did not do that.

17 Q Well, you have information in these charts relating  
18 to DSE's Form Three systems.

19 A Not in the charts that I presented today.

20 Q Let's turn to Chart No. 3b, and don't put it up because  
21 we will spend a lot of time on that later. You have estimated  
22 subscribers total royalty fee and royaty fee per subscriber.  
23 In order to determine the total royalty fee and the royalty  
24 fee per subscriber, would not you have had to determine the  
25 DSE carried by those systems?

A No. As I testified, we calculated the information for

1 small systems. They pay on a fixed fee basis. We added those  
2 all up and substracted it from the known total. So, we did not  
3 calculate the DSE.

4 Q What known total?

5 A 10.6 million subscribers, 8.7 million dollars.

6 Q You say known total 58. You testified those were  
7 estimates based on the 1976 Fact Book data.

8 A Certainly. This is a unique proceeding obviously.

9 We are relying on estimate. I don't think I, as  
10 a reseacher, can say each of these numbers is precisely 29.257.  
11 We are dealing with estimates. Based on the best information  
12 available, these estimates looked very reasonable then. They  
13 look reasonable now. It has been related to me that the 8.7  
14 million dollar figure, which is included in legislative history,  
15 was that figure that Congress wanted to achieve. Given the  
16 known subscribers when you divide that out, that is the royalty  
17 fee per subscriber.

18 Q Ms. Beales, what knowledge do you have that, that is  
19 the number that Congress wanted to achieve?

20 A The included it in the legislative history.

21 Q Does that mean that they wanted to achieve it or  
22 the included it in the legislative history as a number given  
23 to them a number that might be?

24 A Since I was not there, I cannot tell you.

25 Q You don't know that, that is the number they wanted to  
achieve?

1 A I only know it is what is in the legislative history.

2 Q Are you familiar with files by NCTA on May 19 in this  
3 proceeding, the charts?

4 A Yes, I am.

5 Q The chart is not numbered. It lists the distant  
6 signal equivalent for cable systems in 1976?

7 A Yes.

8 Q How did you arrive at 2.5 DSE equivalents?

9 A That chart was corrected from worksheets in the NCTA  
10 file. The estimates came from a sampling fact book at the  
11 current time, going through each system listed and figuring out  
12 how many DSE systems they carried and coming up with this esti-  
13 mate. I found evidence that MPA conducted a similar survey,  
14 and it was 2.5. We decided to change our methodology for this  
15 procedure to reflect publicly available data. It is hard to  
16 reflect what people were thinking in '76. Of course, the results  
17 come out very similar between the two methodologies.

18 Q You said publicly available data?

19 A Yes. It is publicly available.

20 Q But not the latest publicly available information?

21 A No. Just publicly available.

22 Q You could have worked up data that was reflective of  
23 the actual industry as it did exist in 1976 on the basis of  
24 subsequent data?

25 A I believe the information that was available in '76  
was accurate as any subsequent information.

1 Q We determined already the data in the 1976 Fact Book  
2 to be considerably out of date. There are fact books now for  
3 1979 that would have reflected the cable industry as it existed  
4 in 1976. Is that not true?

5 A We have not determined that it was inaccurate.

6 Q I did not say it was inaccurate. I said it was not  
7 up to date.

8 A We don't know that the cable systems changed their  
9 subscribers.

10 Q You are telling me that you proceeded under the  
11 assumption that cable systems would not have changed their  
12 subscribers between March of '76 to October 19, 1976?

13 A Some of them may or may not. I utilized the fact  
14 book that was utilized when the data was compiled back in  
15 1976.

16 Q Getting back to the estimate of 2.5 DSE's in you  
17 April or May filing, do you have any idea as to how those  
18 DSE's were calculated?

19 A I understand they pulled a sample of 100 cable systems  
20 on NCTA's part and 100 cable systems on MPA's part and analyzed  
21 how many DSE's were carried on those systems and carried up  
22 with an estimate of 2.5.

23 Q How was that analysis conducted?

24 A I did not do it. I do not know the details of it. I  
25 only know that was the study. I think an outside consultant  
was hired.

1 MR. FELDSTEIN: In light of the fact a large number of  
2 facts were being directed on how a calculation was made in  
3 1976 which Ms. Beales did not take part in, this is the one by the  
4 copyright owner's counsel and his research people and person  
5 who is presently working with the National Cable Television  
6 Association. We would be pleased to proffer her as a witness.  
7 The questions can be directed to her as to precisely how the  
8 1976 estimates were derived which were supplied to Congress.

9 MR. ATTAWAY: Madam Chairman, this witness testified  
10 to information contained in these charts. That information was  
11 based on the 1976 Fact Book and calculations made from that  
12 fact book.

13 MR. FELDSTEIN: I will remind counsel for the copyright  
14 owners you are asking questions about a chart in the May  
15 filing to which Ms. Beales did not testify to.

16 MR. ATTAWAY: Well, let me move on to questions that do  
17 not relate specifically to the calculations that were actually  
18 done, information that I assume this witness has available  
19 to her.

20 BY MR. ATTAWAY:

21 Q Ms. Beales, are you familiar with statements of  
22 account that are filed by cable systems?

23 A Yes.

24 Q Have you reviewed a fair number of them?

25 A Yes.

Q Is it true, Ms. Beales, very frequently, you find



1 DSE cable systems that report part-time charge one or more  
2 signals?

3 A Some systems do. Yes.

4 Q We found in our review of 1978 one statement of  
5 account, for purposes of distribution proceeding, that 36.1  
6 percent carried at least one part-time signal for which they paid  
7 less than a full DSE value. Is that a reasonable estimate

8 A I have no idea. I have never calculated a percentage.  
9 I never looked at this.

10 Q Is there any way to determine from the data in the  
11 fact book whether 1976 or any other year which signals are  
12 carried full-time and which signals are carried part-time?

13 A I don't know.

14 Q It is likely then whatever analysis was done of the  
15 1976 Fact Book assumed incorrectly that all systems or all  
16 DSE's were carried full-time?

17 A I have no idea. I did not participate in formulating  
18 that data.

19 CHAIRMAN BURG: Let's take a brief recess.

20 (A brief recess was taken.)  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

CHAIRMAN BURG: Back on the record.

57

MR. ATTAWAY: May I proceed?

CHAIRMAN BURG: Yes. Please do.

BY MR. ATTAWAY:

Q Mrs. Beales, you testified that the 8.10 million subscriber estimate probably relied on the 1976 --

A I believe the number was 10.8.

Q 10.8. Excuse me.

If the \$8.7 million estimated royalty figure is also derived from information probably it is derived from information in the 1976 Fact Book; is that correct?

A I do not know that the \$8.7 million figure came from the Fact Book.

Q Where would it have come from?

A I was not there at the time.

MR. FELDSTEIN: Again, Madam Chairman, this line of questioning, she has testified as to what she found in the legislative list Friday. She does not know how those figures were arrived at. I repeat, I can proffer a witness who can testify, if that line of questioning is considered to be important to this proceeding.

BY MR. ATTAWAY:

Q Is it fair to say the 8.10 per subscriber estimate in the House Report was reached by dividing 10.8 million subscribers listed in the House Report into \$8.7 million listed in the House Report?

1 A That certainly appears to be correct.

2 Q When one does that division, you do reach 81 cents?

3 A Yes. That is correct.

4 Q If whatever information Congress relied upon in  
5 estimating 10.8 million subscribers and \$8.7 million in  
6 royalty payments was out of date, incomplete, inaccurate, then  
7 the 81 cents per subscription fee per subscriber could also  
8 not be relied on?

9 A I believe if anything the 81 cents might be too high.  
10 It might be a lower number.

11 Q It might be a higher number.

12 A We do know there were more subscribers at the time  
13 the law was enacted. The information was January 1. The Act  
14 was in October. The estimate important to end of the year was  
15 higher. So there was subscriber royalty which would make the  
16 81 cents even lower, probably about 75 cents.

17 Q Mrs. Beales, to your knowledge, does anyone know or  
18 has anyone attempted to determine, based on information now  
19 available, what the per subscriber royalty fee would have been  
20 in 1978 if cable systems had in fact paid royalty fees in 1976?

21 A I do not know.

22 Q To your knowledge, no one knows; is that correct?

23 A That is correct.

24 Q Thank you.

25 Turn now to Chart 3-A, please. Let's look first at  
the denominator of your equation here. How does one determine

1 the number of cable subscribers in this formula?

2 A You can do it a number of different ways. However  
3 you choose to find out. You can call every cable systems and  
4 ask how many subscribers they have. You can go visit every  
5 cable systems. You can look in the Fact Book data, the data  
6 information, what they report. You can look at various sources  
7 of information.

8 Q How did you do it when you applied this formula in your  
9 subsequent charts?

10 A For 197- --

11 Q For any year.

12 A We utilized the Statement of Account forms.

13 Q How did you reach this number from the Statement of  
14 Account forms?

15 A We used a subscribing household basis. So we relied  
16 in the form, Block E, number of subsidiaries that are  
17 reported. I have a copy of the form. We took the information  
18 out of Section E, Block 1 and at the latter part of the form  
19 on page 7. Actually, it would be D, Section L, where the  
20 systems report how much they are paying.

21 MR. ATTAWAY: I would like to introduce at this time  
22 Copyright Owners Exhibit C-1 which is a Statement of Account,  
23 received on August 29, 1979, by the Copyright Office.

24 MR. FELDSTEIN: Madam Chairman, I object to the  
25 introduction of an exhibit, an unsponsored exhibit on cross-  
examination. If they wish to do something like this, they

JK-4

1 would use their own witness on rebuttal.

2 MR. ATTAWAY: The Witness testified she used the State-  
3 ment of Account to arrive at a subscriber number which is an  
4 element of the formula. I would like her to demonstrate, based  
5 on a Statement of Account which was actually filed, how she  
6 could possibly reach this number based on the Statement of  
7 Account.

8 MR. FELDSTEIN: We have not seen this. We would  
9 certainly need time to do this.

10 CHAIRMAN BURG: I am going to overrule the  
11 objection and recess for lunch. We will resume at 1:30.

12 (Whereupon, the Hearing recessed at 12:00 p.m., to be  
13 resumed at 1:30 p.m. on the same day.)

14 MR. FELDSTEIN: Madam Chairman, Mr. Attaway, when we  
15 were on Direct, when NCTA was on Direct, when you were making  
16 your indirect, there was a question about the questionnaire  
17 NCTA sent. It was stated it would be placed in the record  
18 when we had it duplicated. This is Exhibit 15.

19 CHAIRMAN BURG: All right.

20 (Exhibit No. 15 was marked and received.)

21 MR. ATTAWAY: May I proceed?

22 CHAIRMAN BURG: Please.

23 CROSS-EXAMINATION (Continued)

24 BY MR. ATTAWAY;

25 Q Mrs. Beales, We were examining this formula and how  
you applied this formula to reach much of the data contained

*Accurate Reporting Co., Inc.*

(202) 726-3801

JK-5

1 in subsequent exhibits. We were talking about how you reached  
2 the denominator, cable subscribers for this equation. You  
3 stated, I believe, one of your sources was the Statements of  
4 Account filed by cable systems. I introduced as Copyright  
5 Owners' Exhibit X-1 a Statement of Account filed by cable  
6 systems, WTNJ, Inc. in August of 1979.

7 Could you explain to me and the Tribunal how many  
8 subscribers this cable system had?

9 A I believe if you turn to Section E, Block 1, you  
10 will see number of subscribers residential service to first set,  
11 4,341. They list service to additional sets at 1,114. They  
12 have no FM radio. They list 5 under hotel/motels. Six under  
13 commercial. Nothing under converter, residential or non-  
14 residential.

15 Q Excuse me, please, Mrs. Beales. I think we can all  
16 read it. I would like you to just answer the question. How  
17 many subscribers does this system have with respect to your  
18 formula? When you came across this Statement of Account, which  
19 I assume you did, how many subscribers did you list to apply  
20 in this formula?

21 A In the sample that we took, or in our examination  
22 of the universe, we serviced the first set -- 4,341.

23 Q 4,341.

24 A That's right.

25 Q Nothing else?

A Nothing else.

1 Q What did you divide that into?

2 A Of course, we did it for the entire sample once  
3 we gathered all the data, but in this particular one, we  
4 used total gross receipts. Here it is, Section L, page 7,  
5 block 5, total royalty fee payable for accounting period.

6 Q Do not those total gross receipts or should they not  
7 reflect revenues paid for motels and hotels, commercial and  
8 hospital elderly, whatever that is.

9 A I would presume those are included.

10 Q What you did was divide the number of first set  
11 subscribers into copyright payments which reflected copyright  
12 payments for subscribers, based on subscribers not included in  
13 the denominator?

14 A That is correct. It of course includes the service  
15 to additional sets because it's per a household basis. But the  
16 hotel/motel is not included. We did some tests to show that  
17 this was a relatively small portion and we did other checks  
18 which indicated that this is a fairly accurate number and can  
19 be relied upon.

20 Q Fairly accurate?

21 A Mm-hmm.

22 Q Mrs. Beales, I think this is critical because this  
23 goes to the very heart of the information you have presented  
24 to the Tribunal. You can't rely on this; you can't rely on  
25 any of the portion.

A Oh, I believe it is very reliable. I think the best

1 test.

2 Q I'm sure you do believe it's reliable. I'm not so  
3 sure myself. I would like to show you another Statement of  
4 Account. I would like you to tell me and the Tribunal how  
5 you would have used that in your calculation.

6 MR. FELDSTEIN: Madam Chairman, I have the same  
7 objection I had before. We did have an opportunity to at least  
8 examine the other one. This one could have perhaps been  
9 handed out before lunch as well.

10 CHAIRMAN BURG: Hand it out, Mr. Attaway, and we'll  
11 take some time so Mr. Feldstein can examine it.

12 MR. FELDSTEIN: If you have anymore, perhaps it  
13 would save us some time.

14 MR. ATTAWAY: No, I don't.

15 (A discussion was held off the record.)

16 CHAIRMAN BURG: On the record.

17 MR. ATTAWAY: May I proceed?

18 CHAIRMAN BURG: Please.

19 BY MR. ATTAWAY:

20 Q Mrs. Beales, on this exhibit, Copyright Owner  
21 Exhibit X-1-A, the Statement of Account filed by Warner  
22 Cable Corporation in August of 1979, how many subscribers  
23 would you have counted in your analysis?

24 A There are 870 subscribing households.

25 Q You would have divided that number of subscribers  
into the royalty fee which is on page 7, block 5, \$2,080.91.



1 is that correct?

2 A Yes.

3 Q If you will do that calculation, what is the result?

4 A \$2.39

5 Q I would like to show you the 1980 Fact Book where  
6 that same system is listed. How many subscribers did the Fact  
7 Book indicate for this cable system as of 5/31/79?

8 A Well, it puts it under Stephenville, although it's  
9 filed under Dublin/Stephenville. I'm not sure it's the same  
10 system.

11 Q If you will examine the first page of the Statement  
12 of Account, I think you'll see listed there both Stephenville  
13 and Dublin.

14 A Right. Plus the Warner Cable Corporation of Dublin/  
15 Stephenville. And here is the the Warner Cable of Stephenville,  
16 which may well be the same system. I don't know that.

17 Q If in fact this system had 3,553 subscribers, would  
18 you divide that into the royalty fee paid, \$2,080.91?

19 A Would I do that hypothetically or do you want me  
20 to do it now?

21 A Yes, please.

22 MR. FELDSTEIN: Madam Chairman, we object to this.  
23 Data which we have done has not been on a per system basis.  
24 We testified it is an industry averaging basis. We're going  
25 to get one kind of answer for one system, one kind of answer  
for another system, and what we have done is an average of all

JK-9

1 systems. She is being asked to do something which has not been  
2 done, which is inconsistent with the testimony and the  
3 methodology which we have testified that we used.

4 MR. ATTAWAY: Madam Chairman, if I can demonstrate that  
5 the individual parts that went into the whole are unreliable  
6 and inaccurate, I think it will cast grave doubt as to the  
7 accuracy of the information in these exhibits. That's  
8 exactly what I'm trying to establish.

9 MR. FELDSTEIN: Madam Chairman, an average is an  
10 average. You're going to have high results. You're going to  
11 have low results. You're going to have middle results. The  
12 result for one system is indeed just that, the result of one  
13 system. And we are not relying on the result for one system,  
14 either this system or any other system.

15 CHAIRMAN BURG: Mr. Feldstein, the Chair overrules  
16 that objection.

17 WITNESS: It rounds to 59 cents. 58.5676.

18 BY MR. ATTAWAY:

19 Q As opposed to the \$2.39 you would have reached had you  
20 used the subscriber count indicated on the Statement of  
21 Account?

22 A Yes.

23 Q Mrs. Beales, did you make any attempt to check the  
24 accuracy of the information that you used in compiling this  
25 information?

A No, the forms we used were from the Public Information

*Accurate Reporting Co., Inc.*

(202) 726-3801

JK-10

1 file, which presumably have been checked by the Copyright  
2 Office.

3 Q On the face of the statements themselves, did you  
4 make any calculations to see if the information listed on  
5 these statements was reasonable?

6 A I assumed that what the Copyright Office put in  
7 their Public Information file was accurate.

8 COMMISSIONER JAMES: Excuse me, Counselor, could  
9 you go back just a minute? I am a little confused.

10 Going back to your very first example of dividing.  
11 What was the numerator. Was it \$209,400 divided by 870  
12 subscribers?

13 MR. ATTAWAY: Yes, sir.

14 THE WITNESS: No, it was not.

15 MR. COOPER: The royalty fee.

16 THE WITNESS: In Block L --

17 COMMISSIONER JAMES: Oh, I see.

18 THE WITNESS: It's the payment, the actual royalty  
19 payment.

20 COMMISSIONER JAMES: Thank you.

21 MR. ATTAWAY: Commissioner James, you've touched upon  
22 the next point I was going to make.

23 BY MR. ATTAWAY:

24 Q Had you attempted to introduce a system of quality --

25 COMMISSIONER JAMES: Excuse me just one more time.  
I'm getting a different figure each time. You

*Accurate Reporting Co., Inc.*

(202) 726-3801

1 divided what by what now?

2 THE WITNESS: I took \$2,080.91.

3 COMMISSIONER BURG: Block 4 and 5.

4 THE WITNESS: Block 4 and 5 are identical.

5 COMMISSIONER JAMES: And divided by?

6 THE WITNESS: The subscriber figure on this Form  
7 870, service to first set residential.

8 COMMISSIONER JAMES: Okay. Thank you.

9 BY MR. ATTAWAY:

10 Q Mrs. Beales, if you would divide the number of sub-  
11 scribers into the gross receipts listed on page 7, block K,  
12 a very high number, \$240.69.

13 A You have given me two samples. Which one am I  
14 supposed to be looking at right now?

15 Q 1-A.

16 A The Warner Cable of Dublin/Stephenville or WTMJ?

17 Q Yes, ma'am, Warner Cable.

18 A Warner Cable, yes.

19 Q I say again, if you divide the number of subscribers  
20 listed into the total gross receipts, 209,400, would you get,  
21 would you do that for me? Divide 209,400, which is the gross  
22 receipts listed, by 870.

23 A Which give you a gross receipts per subscriber of  
24 \$240.69, rounded.

25 Q If you divide that by six to calculate the monthly  
fee per subscriber.

1 A Divided by six, it's \$40.11.

2 Q That's a fairly high monthly fee; is it not?

3 A I don't know what the situation is.

4 Q Are you aware of any cable system that charges \$40  
5 per month per subscriber?

6 A Not personally.

7 Q How does that compare with what the cable system  
8 itself reported as their monthly basic rate?

9 A It is larger.

10 Q What did they report?

11 A They reported \$7.50 per month for the first set  
12 residential.

13 Q Turning away from the denominator of this equation  
14 and looking at the numerator, what elements are reflected in  
15 copyright payments? How do you calculate copyright payments?

16 A I did not calculate copyright payments other than to  
17 take the royalty fee that was listed on the form for each  
18 system. I didn't calculate it for the system.

19 Q How did cable systems do it? Not the exact number  
20 but what elements go into this calculation?

21 A As I understand it from the form, not working for  
22 cable systems, you would include your gross receipts which you  
23 are directed to take from the secondary transmission service  
24 section and come up with a minimum fee. You include your  
25 DSEs. You carry out the calculation to indicate whether you  
have distant stations. You put in your distant signal

1 equivalents and you multiply this as a factor, and you come  
2 up with a royalty fee.

3 Q It is not a result of total basic subscriber revenues  
4 and the number of distant signals carried?

5 A That sounds accurate.

6 Q Turning back to the statute where you read the two  
7 factors that the decision of this Tribunal is supposed to  
8 reflect, was it not inflation and subscriber charges?

9 MR. FELDSTEIN: Objection. This was the answer that  
10 you gave in our argument. We stated that there were other  
11 factors relevant. You're asking her for a legal conclusion.

12 BY MR. ATTAWAY:

13 Q It is true, is it not Mrs. Beales, that this equation  
14 does include other factors than inflation and subscriber  
15 charges and specifically the factor of number of distant  
16 signal carriers?

17 A On the form?

18 Q In your formula, the numerator.

19 A Copyright payments?

20 Q Right.

21 A Copyright payments are paid on the basis of DSEs, in  
22 addition to other things.

23 Q Mrs. Beales, were you present when Mr. Crandall  
24 testified on behalf of NCTA?

25 A Yes, I was.

Q Do you recall that with respect to one of our

1 exhibits, Mr. Crandle was critical of our showing of the  
2 increase in payments made by television stations for programs  
3 because it reflected both increase in program pricing and an  
4 increase in amount of programs that were purchased. Do you  
5 recall that?

6 A Yes.

7 Q Doesn't your formula suffer from exactly the same  
8 flaw?

9 A We did a number of tests before we gathered the data  
10 in the manner that we did. You have shown us some extreme  
11 examples of difficulties in dealing with the data.

12 Q Excuse me. This question has no relationship at all  
13 to the accuracy of the data from the Statement of Accounts.  
14 I'm just saying that does not your formula include both or  
15 reflect both an increase in subscriber payments and an increase  
16 in the amount of programs used which was Dr. Crandle's  
17 objection to our exhibit?

18 A It may or may not include an increase in the programs  
19 used. We did not test that on this entire sample. It certainly  
20 includes an increase on the basic subscriber charge.

21 Q I believe I have already showed you a page from your  
22 May filing where you estimated DSEs in 1978 would have been 2.5  
23 and on your Chart No. 9, you estimate the DSEs in 1979 to be  
24 2.90. Is that not an increase?

25 A The 2.5 increase, of course, was for 1976, not for  
1978.

JK-15

1 Q Well, let's just take your chart now. In 1978, one,  
2 you list DSEs at 2.65 and 1979, two, you list DSEs as 2.90.  
3 Is that not an increase?

4 A Yes.

5 Q You are reflecting an increase in DSEs or increase  
6 in programs carried?

7 A From '78, one to '79, two, yes, there was an  
8 increase, based on that particular sample. It was not a whole  
9 universe.

10 Q Would you apply this formula to cable systems --  
11 when you applied this formula, is there any way to distinguish  
12 between cable systems that increase their subscriber rates and  
13 systems that increase their DSEs.

14 A Not if you are taking total royalty fees paid.

15 Q You don't know; is that correct?

16 A If the basis is total royalty fees, I wouldn't pre-  
17 sume to separate it for a system.

18 Q Let's take a sample to illustrate this. You have  
19 a cable system with 1,000 subscribers. \$100,000 of gross  
20 revenues carrying one DSE or .675 percent value. How would  
21 you calculate the royalty fee per subscriber? Once again,  
22 1,000 subscribers. 1,000 is your denominator.

23 A I wouldn't calculate it. I took the information off  
24 the forms. I didn't calculate it for any of the systems.  
25 Whatever the system reported. I don't work --

Q Is it not important to determine in this proceeding



whether the royalty fee per subscriber resulted from carriage of more programs or increase of subscriber rates?

A I don't think it is important.

Q Turn to Chart 3-B, please.

A Okay.

Q As an initial matter, you noted when we examined this chart that this chart lists for DSE systems and throughout I am going to be talking about DSE system only. Estimated subscribers of 7,586,000. Your May 19 filing on a similar chart for 1976 DSEs systems subs, you listed 7,776,000 subscribers. Similarly, there is a discrepancy in the royalty fee listed here and not listed in the May pleading, and the per subscriber royalty fee. What accounts for these differences?

A Different methodologies, as I explained earlier.

Q I'm sorry. I must have missed that explanation. I thought all of this data was derived from the 1976 Fact Book.

A No. The estimate that was included in the May filing, as I indicated in response to your earlier question today, was based on worksheets which were in NCTA files which ultimately had relied upon the Fact Book. They were, it is just a different methodology in how we calculated this particular chart which came only from publicly available data. It did not rely on any worksheets or whatever. Of course, the results are similar.

Q What was the publicly related data relied upon for these numbers?

1 A As I explained yesterday, the subscriber figures  
2 were based upon the 1976 Fact Book. The average basic sub-  
3 scriber rate was based on responses to the Tribunal survey  
4 as to the rates charged by cable systems in October 19, 1976.

5 Q Mrs. Beales, are you saying that you used the monthly  
6 service charges reflected in the CRT questionnaire for 1976  
7 in reaching these numbers?

8 A Yes.

9 Q I find that hard to believe. I would like to  
10 explore this in some considerable detail. Let's start out with  
11 the royalty fee for DSE systems, 7,444,752. Now, the average  
12 DSEs in 1976, according to your May filing, was 2.5. 2.5  
13 DSEs, I believe equal a royalty percentage payment of .013125.  
14 If your counsel would like to check my arithmetic, please do  
15 so.

16 Do you accept that?

17 A Fine.

18 Q In order to determine gross revenues, I think  
19 you would take the royalty fee; would you do this calculation,  
20 please. 7,444,752 divided by .013125.

21 Q Could you state the results and write this down for  
22 further reference, please?

23 A I am not sure how many zeros are on this. 567,219,200.

24 Q That's correct.

25 Now, if we divide that number, which would be the  
gross receipts, by the total number of subscribers, estimated

1 subscribers, and please do this calculation so you can follow  
2 through with me, divide 567,219,200 divided by 7,586,050.  
3 What is the result?

4 A 74.77.

5 Q And if we further divide that by 12, we get the  
6 average monthly subscriber charge. It is 623, is it not?

7 A Yes.

8 Q Tht 623 would include first sets and additional  
9 sets, would it not?

10 A Yes.

11 Q Since both first set revenue and additional set  
12 revenue are supposed to be used to compute the royalty payment.  
13 Now, referring back to Copyright Owners Exhibit showing the  
14 results of the CRT survey, I believe we found that the average  
15 first set only royalty fee in 1976 was \$6.61. Your exhibit  
16 found that it was \$6.69. So, for purposes of going through  
17 this calculation, let's strike an average of between \$6.65.  
18 Now, if your Exhibit 8 you said that 30 percent of subscribers  
19 pay for additional sets; is that correct?

20 A In 1978-1.

21 Q You also said that or indicated on that chart that  
22 the average payment for additional sets was 22.5 percent of the  
23 first set rate.

24 A In '78-1? That's not on my chart. I didn't put  
25 that on my chart.

Q I think that was included in your oral testimony.

JK-19

1 A I don't believe so.

2 Q What I am trying to do, Mrs. Beales, is reduce this  
3 \$6.23 to an average firm set rate that is reflected in your  
4 chart 3-B. If you will accept that 20 percent of subscribers  
5 paid for additional sets and that average payment for an  
6 additional set is somewhere in the vicinity of 22.5 percent  
7 and you used that in an equation where \$6.23, the first set  
8 revenue plus additional sets, equals --

9 MR. FELDSTEIN: Madam Chairman, I'm very troubled  
10 by this line of questioning because Mrs. Beales, in her  
11 exhibits, did not in any way pretend to calculate in this  
12 fashion. She used the 81 cents per royalty fee per subscriber  
13 which was found in the legislative history. She went back  
14 using the methodology, having nothing to do, as she described  
15 before, having nothing to do with the kind of methodology which  
16 Mr. Attaway is attempting to take her through in order to  
17 break this down through DSE systems and small systems. We said  
18 we did not believe it was necessary because you could use the  
19 legislative history data for all systems. She testified on  
20 the basis of that, the correct measure was the royalty fee per  
21 subscriber in 1976 and the royalty fee per subscriber in 1980.  
22 She did not testify that this determination went on a number of  
23 DSEs, per DSEs, royalty fee per DSE, royalty fee per set,  
24 royalty fee per programming. Only royalty fee per subscriber.  
25 Only royalty fee per subscriber. And she made no such similar  
calculations. If Mr. Attaway has a purpose in running this

JK-20

1 kind of a calculation back through using a different methodology,  
2 perhaps he ought to put a witness on of his own on rebuttal  
3 to prove or disprove some points.

4 MR. ATTAWAY: Madam Chairman, the Witness clearly  
5 and specifically testified that in constructing this chart, she  
6 used the average royalty payment for first set as reflected in  
7 the CRT survey, the average subscriber fee. I submit to you  
8 that she could not have possibly used that because these  
9 numbers do not reflect such a subscriber fee. In fact,  
10 they reflect a much lower subscriber fee. In fact, according to  
11 my calculations, a fee of \$5.88, not the \$6.69 that the NCTA  
12 exhibit shows and Mrs. Beales testified that she used.

13 MR. FELDSTEIN: She has testified on Chart 3-C that  
14 she figured out for the small systems using the methodology that  
15 was described. She has testified that the remainder was an  
16 estimate based on subtraction. That is the only calculation  
17 that she made on DSE systems.

18 CHAIRMAN BURG: Mr. Feldstein, again the Tribunal  
19 is going to overrule that objection.

20 BY MR. ATTAWAY:

21 Q Mrs. Beales, how did you use the CRT subscriber  
22 basic rate which is reflected in your exhibit, I think, as \$6.69  
23 in this chart?

24 A I did not.

25 Q Earlier you testified that you did.

A If you will look at 3-C, you will see that I testified

1 that I used the \$6.16, which was the average basic monthly  
2 subscriber rate which was for the systems less than 80,000 in  
3 gross receipts. I also testified that I used the figure of \$6.64  
4 for the medium sized systems. Those are systems with gross  
5 receipts of 80,000 to 160,000 and 160 to 320. Those were the  
6 only two figures that I used from the Tribunal questionnaire.

7 Q Why didn't you use the Tribunal number for the DSE  
8 systems?

9 A I felt that I could not accurately estimate the DSEs.  
10 I didn't know what they were. Hence, where you had a fixed fee  
11 or flat formula to pay on for the small systems, it was  
12 relatively easy to make an estimate of the smaller systems,  
13 total estimated subscribers and royalty fee. I subtracted that  
14 from the known number, which is 10.8 million subscribers and  
15 \$8.7. That's what I testified earlier.

16 Q Mrs. Beales, I think we've already established the  
17 10.8 million subscribers was not a known number. It was an  
18 estimated number.

19 A Which was later converted to the estimate for that  
20 year.

21 Q I think we have already established that that  
22 estimated number is subject to serious challenge with respect  
23 to its accuracy. So, please don't refer to it as a known  
24 number.

25 A The number listed in the legislative history that  
Congress relied on.

JK-22

1 Q Thank you.

2 Had you have used the basic subscriber rate listed  
3 in the CRT survey in calculating the royalty fee per sub-  
4 scriber for DSE systems, how would that have affected your  
5 result?

6 A I have no idea. I did not do it that way.

7 Q If the royalty fee in your chart is too low, then the  
8 royalty fee per subscriber is also too low; is it not? It  
9 would be much more.

10 A I'm not attempting to say that this is absolutely  
11 98.00. I have never maintained that. What I'm trying to give  
12 you is an estimate based on estimated data which obviously has  
13 some limitations. We have admitted this from the very beginning.  
14 I think what you see here is a reasonable estimate as to what  
15 the royalty fee per subscriber was, utilizing the information  
16 that was listed in the legislative history.

17 Q But, Mrs. Beales, please appreciate my problem that  
18 for systems you're using the Congressional estimate and the  
19 Fact Book data. For others, you are using the CRT questionnaire  
20 data, and I can't make heads or tails of this.

21 A I'm sorry.

22 Q I don't understand how the Tribunal can.

23 Well, let's pass this. Turn to Chart 3-C, please.  
24 Referring to this chart, does the average monthly subscriber  
25 rate include second set revenues?

A The average basic monthly subscriber rate comes from

*Accurate Reporting Co., Inc.*

(202) 726-3801

JK-23

1 the CRT questionnaire which I believe asks for average basic  
2 monthly subscriber rates. So it's what the systems interpreted  
3 the CRT's questionnaire.

4 Q I believe the questionnaire refers to service to the  
5 first set, the retransmission of television-radio broadcast.

6 A That is where the figure comes from.

7 Q How were the subscribers estimated?

8 A We utilized the chart called, "System by Subscriber  
9 Size," from the 1976 Television Fact Book as the basis of the  
10 information. That is the source. Do you want more information?

11 Q No. That's fine.

12 How did you arrive at the average basic monthly  
13 subscriber rate listed here?

14 A I'm sorry. I didn't hear the last part. Could you  
15 repeat?

16 Q How did you arrive at the average basic monthly  
17 subscriber rate listed on this chart?

18 A We took that information from the responses to the  
19 Copyright Royalty Tribunal survey.

20 Q Now, here again, we have a combination of 1976 Fact  
21 Book Data and 1980 CRT questionnaire data.

22 A Right. Which we reflect the basic subscriber rate on  
23 October 19, 1976.

24 Q Since you used the Fact Book for gross receipts and  
25 number of subscribers, why didn't you calculate an average basic  
monthly subscriber rate from the Fact Book so we had all

*Accurate Reporting Co., Inc.*

(202) 726-3801



JK-24

1 consistent source material in here?

2 A I did not go through and add up all 3,000 or 4,000  
3 basic subscriber rates that were listed when I had a very  
4 reasonable estimate of what the systems reported to the  
5 Copyright Tribunal their rate was at that time. It's an  
6 average. It looked like a very reasonable average based on a  
7 large sample. Only the subscribers, per se, came from the  
8 Fact Book.

9 Q Let's turn to Chart 4, please.

10 I believe in your testimony two days ago in answer to  
11 a question from Commissioner James you stated that this  
12 information was collected in-house?

13 A That is correct.

14 Q I noted that in your May filing, there was a chart  
15 containing very similar information and the source is given as  
16 BI Associates. Did you use, did you redo this data or did you  
17 use the information provided by BI Associates?

18 A Which chart are you referring to? In this chart, the  
19 source indicates, "Summary of Payments By Category for All  
20 Systems by BI Associates," indicates that the 41,500 to 160,000  
21 categories accounted for 8 percent of total payments in '78-1,  
22 and 9 percent in 1979-1. That was the only time we ever used  
23 that information.

24 Q So there's no data based on an outside source in this  
25 chart?

A That is right.

JK-25

1 Q I notice that in May filing, 3,676 systems were  
2 analyzed on the chart. Eighty less than listed on this chart.  
3 Yet, in the May filing, the total 1979-2 royalty payments were  
4 \$7,760,740, \$274,771 more than shown here.

5 CHAIRMAN BURG: Would you give us that figure again?

6 MR. ATTAWAY: I'm sorry. I said in the May 1979,  
7 in the May NCTA filing, the total 1979-2 royalty payments were  
8 listed as \$7,760,740, which is \$274,771 more than shown here.

9 BY MR. ATTAWAY:

10 Q What is the reason for this discrepancy?

11 A In the filing that we made in May, we did not do an  
12 analysis of the Statement of Account forms. The source clearly  
13 indicates the information from the May filing came from a  
14 conversation with a person in the Copyright Office who gave me  
15 these figures. This is a study that we did looking at all of  
16 the 1979-2 Statement of Account forms that were in the Public  
17 Information file as of September 9th, 1980, where we went  
18 through and transferred information off of those forms, the  
19 subscribers and the royalty fee that they listed. We added  
20 them up and divided. The form that we provided in May was just  
21 information that we received from the Copyright Office as to the  
22 totals that they had at that point. The figures, of course,  
23 do not correspond. In May, we reported that 7.7 million had  
24 been collected. Now, of course, that number is up to 8.1  
25 million.

Q That is a satisfactory explanation.

JK-26

1 Let's go to 4-A. I believe you said that you  
2 arrived at the subscriber counts used and reflected on this  
3 chart, as well as the previous chart, on the basis of your  
4 examination of Statements of Account.

5 A That is correct.

6 Q Keeping in mind Copyright Owners' Exhibit X-1,  
7 which indicated -- which illustrated that the only way to  
8 obtain a number for any given cable system, a subscriber number  
9 from any given cable system filing a statement of account  
10 would be to list the number of first set, non-commercial  
11 subscribers listed; is that correct?

12 A You stated that that was the only way to get it.

13 Q If I'm incorrect, please inform me.

14 A What we took off the form as I have testified, was  
15 the first set figure.

16 Q Now, by failing to include any commercial subscribers  
17 in your subscriber count, have you not seriously -- strike,  
18 please.

19 Have you not underestimated the number of subscribers?

20 A Based on tests we did, we felt if we understated it,  
21 it was by a very slight amount.

22 Q If you did underestimate the number of subscribers,  
23 would not all of the figures in the last column, the royalty  
24 fee per subscriber, be too high?

25 A Based on our test, it could change by a cent or two.

Q That's not what I asked. I asked if you underestimated

JK-27

1 subscribers, would not the annualized royalty fee per subscriber  
2 in the last column be too high? Not how much.

3 A If we had underestimated them, it could have been too  
4 high.

5 Q Thank you.

6 Let's go to Chart 5, please.

7 What I would like to do, since we only examined the  
8 DSE systems in our examination of the CRT Statement of Account,  
9 and because only the royalty rates for DSE systems are subject  
10 to adjustment in this proceeding, I would like to use your  
11 format here, but only for DSE systems.

12 I believe in previous charts you have represented that  
13 DSE systems in 1976 had a royalty payment per subscriber of  
14 98 cents; is that correct?

15 A Yes. That's what I've estimated.

16 Q That figure in 1980 was given as \$1.28; is that  
17 correct?

18 A Yes.

19 Q That is an increase of 31 percent, I believe; is  
20 that correct?

21 A That is how I calculated, as well.

22 Q I believe you also testified that this increase  
23 results from two factors: increase in basic subscriber charges,  
24 and increase in DSEs carried; is that correct?

25 A I have testified that there are four components which  
can affect it, and I have data comparing '76 to '80 for the basic

*Accurate Reporting Co., Inc.*

(202) 726-3801

JK-28

1 subscriber rate. I have other periods of time which seem to  
2 show increases in some of the other factors.

3 Q I think you have provided us with information by  
4 which we can extract exactly how much of this 31 percent  
5 increase is due to increases in subscriber payments and,  
6 excuse me, increase in subscriber charges, and how much is  
7 due to increase in DSEs. I would like to work through this with  
8 you, if I may. I think it is very important to the Tribunal  
9 to be able to separate out these two elements from your  
10 equation.

11 MR. FELDSTEIN: I object to that, Madam Chairman.  
12 If Counsel wishes to do this, he can do this using his own  
13 direct witness. We have not attempted to do this. We have  
14 stated only that the royalty per subscriber had indeed  
15 increased from 1976 to 1980. We have identified those  
16 factors which we think contribute to that. We have not  
17 attempted to quantify them. If Counsel at all -- my witness  
18 has not attempted to quantify them, has not quantify them, has  
19 not tried to quantify them. If Counsel for the Copyright  
20 Owners wants to try to quantify them, he is entitled to do so,  
21 but I believe it ought to be done by him using his witness, and  
22 on rebuttal.

23 MR. ATTAWAY: Madam Chairman, the only data I have  
24 available on this subject is supplied by NCTA, supervised, or  
25 actually accomplished by this witness. I think that this  
witness would be more competent to go through these calculations

JK-29

1 with, based on her data than any witness I can provide.

2 MR. FELDMAN: Do you think your own witness --  
3 would Counsel's witness be the same as an adverse witness pro-  
4 vided by NCTA? The data is the data.

5 CHAIRMAN BURG: The Chair overrules the objection.

6 MR. ATTAWAY: Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN BURG: Let's take a recess.

8 (A recess was taken.)

9 CHAIRMAN BURG: Back on the record.

10 MR. ATTAWAY: I would like to pass out at this time  
11 two exhibits that are only to permit the witness and the  
12 Tribunal to follow along with the calculations and allow the  
13 record to reflect these calculations that we are about to make.

14 (Copyright Owners Exhibits 2 and 3 were  
15 marked and received in the record.)

16 MR. FELDSTEIN: Madam Chairman, I object. Mr. Attaway  
17 is handing out his exhibits so that the witness and the Tribunal  
18 can follow along with the calculations that he is about to make  
19 in the cross-examination as NCTA's witness.

20 MR. ATTAWAY: Madam Chairman, I believe --

21 CHAIRMAN BURG: Just one moment, please.

22 With respect to what you just said, Mr. Felstein,  
23 we have a number of precedents from other proceedings where we  
24 have allowed this. We are proceeding on precedents that we,  
25 ourselves, have set.

MR. ATTAWAY: I was merely going to make that same

*Accurate Reporting Co., Inc.*

(202) 726-3301

JK-30

1 point, that I was following the precedents that the Tribunal  
2 previously made.

3 BY MR. ATTAWAY:

4 Q Mrs. Beales, If you will refer to COX-2, we've listed  
5 here the 1976 gross revenue for basic service per subscriber  
6 annualized which we extracted from NCTA Exhibit 3-B. We  
7 calculated by taking the royalty payments divided by the  
8 average number of DSEs which you said existed, would have  
9 existed in 1976, in order to determine gross revenues, and we  
10 divided gross revenues by your subscriber count to reach an  
11 annual 1976 per subscriber payment of \$74.77. If you want to  
12 check any of these numbers, please stop me at any point.

13 We determined the 1979-2 annualized gross revenues  
14 for basic service by essentially the same calculations. Are all  
15 of these numbers that we have used the numbers that you  
16 included in your exhibits?

17 A I did not include the estimate of DSEs.

18 Q Excuse me. That's correct. The DSE estimate was  
19 taken from the May filing of NCTA. They were not introduced  
20 in Mrs. Beales' testimony.

21 We then calculated an annual royalty payment per  
22 subscriber based on this data in NCTA Exhibit 3-B and 4-A. We  
23 calculated 98 cents per payment per subscriber in 1976, a \$1.28  
24 royalty payment per subscriber in 1979-2. In fact, those were  
25 the numbers listed on one of your exhibits; is that correct?

A Yes.

*Accurate Reporting Co., Inc.*

(202) 726-3801

JK-31

1 Q That reflects, does it not, a 30 cent increase  
2 during that period?

3 A Yes.

4 Q Which is a 30.6 percent increase during that  
5 period; is that correct?

6 A Yes.

7 Q That's 1979-2 over 1976.

8 A Yes.

9 Q If you turn to COX-3, please. Again, using the  
10 same data extracted from NCTA's May filing and Mrs. Beales'  
11 testimony, we have calculated the royalty percentage equivalent  
12 to 2.5 DSEs and 2.9 DSEs. The percentages are 1.3125 for 2.5  
13 DSEs and 1.4825 for 2.9 DSEs. The DSEs increased a total of  
14 16 percent. Because the royalty rate is graduated, a smaller  
15 rate as the number of signals increase, the percentage of  
16 decrease in the royalty percentage is smaller. It's 13 percent.  
17 Going down to the next heading, "Increase in Royalty Payments  
18 per Subscriber Due to Increase in Distant Signal Equivalents."  
19 If we multiply the 1976 annual revenue per subscriber by the  
20 effective DSE percentage or 2.5 DSEs, we reach 98 cents, which  
21 is the royalty fee per subscriber listed on Mrs. Beales' chart.  
22 If we apply the same 1976 annual per subscriber revenue to the  
23 royalty percent or 2.9 DSEs, which is the increase, we get  
24 \$1.11. That's a 13 percent increase. Are those figures  
25 correct?

A I'm not -- I don't know if your figures are correct --

*Accurate Reporting Co., Inc.*

(202) 726-3301



1 I don't know --

2 MR. FELDSTEIN: Objection. There's no way she can  
3 attest to the correctness of these figures. These are not  
4 her calculations.

5 CHAIRMAN BURG: Are you asking her to do the calcula-  
6 tions?

7 MR. ATTAWAY: If she wishes to.

8 CHAIRMAN BURG: If you wish to.

9 THE WITNESS: I do not wish to do the mathematics.

10 BY MR. ATTAWAY:

11 Q Going on at the bottom of this Exhibit, if 1976  
12 royalty per subscriber is 98 percent as you presented.

13 CHAIRMAN BURG: 98 cents.

14 BY MR. ATTAWAY:

15 Q Excuse me. 98 cents. And the 1979-2 royalty payment  
16 per subscriber is \$1.28 as you represented, an increase of  
17 30 cents, the increase due to additional DSEs which we've  
18 just calculated would be 13 cents and the increase due to  
19 higher basic revenues would be 17 cents. From that we can see  
20 the percent increase due to higher basic revenues was 17.3  
21 percent. That's not too far off from the percent increase in  
22 basic revenues extracted from the CRT survey information; is  
23 that correct?

24 A If these numbers are correct.

25 Q What was the percent increase in basic subscriber  
rates from the CRT questionnaire that you calculated?

JK-33

1 A For DSE systems only?

2 Q Yes, ma'am.

3 A Fourteen percent.

4 Q These figures, this calculation was all used --  
5 this calculation was exclusively used as data in the NCTA  
6 exhibits. If your estimate for the royalty payment per  
7 subscriber in 1976 which was based on the Fact Book data was  
8 too low, the percent increase from '76 to '79-2 would be  
9 reduced; would it not?

10 A If it were too low.

11 Q Let's turn now to Exhibit 7. We will skip an  
12 exhibit.

13 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: How did you compute that on  
14 your cross-examination Exhibit 3, that 1.3125? From the  
15 statute?

16 MR. ATTAWAY: Excuse me, the --

17 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: The royalty percent of gross  
18 revenues for two-and-a-half distant signals.

19 MR. ATTAWAY: Oh, that's just adding the DSEs. You  
20 add .675 for the first DSE, plus .425 for the second DSE and  
21 half of .425 for the .5 DSE.

22 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: That's what I did. I got a  
23 different figure and I just wondered.

24 THE WITNESS: I get that figure.

25 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Okay. Maybe I did something  
wrong.

JK-34

1 MR. ATTAWAY: It works out on my calculator.

2 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Okay.

3 BY MR. ATTAWAY:

4 Q Mrs. Beales, could we go to Chart 7, now?

5 COMMISSIONER BURG: Mr. Cooper, before I forget, we  
6 need two more sets of these exhibits. Cross-exam 1 and  
7 Cross-exam 1-A.

8 Thank you.

9 MR. ATTAWAY: May I proceed?

10 COMMISSIONER BURG: Yes.

11 BY MR. ATTAWAY:

12 Q Mrs. Beales, it says or indicates here in this  
13 exhibit that you examined 524 DSE system questionnaires.

14 A Well, we examined 551. 524 had listed rates as of  
15 October 19, 1976.

16 Q In Mr. Cooper's testimony, I believe he stated he  
17 indicated 653, 129 more than you examined. Do you have any  
18 idea what could have accounted for this difference?

19 A Yes.

20 Q Would you please tell us?

21 A We examined the forms that had been received by the  
22 Tribunal as of July 15th, 1980, and I believe Mr. Cooper  
23 examined at a somewhat later date. Perhaps the Tribunal  
24 received some more forms.

25 Q You also examined more forms for the April 1980  
number than you did -- you have listed more systems under

*Accurate Reporting Co., Inc.*

(202) 726-3801

JK-35

1 April 1980 than you do under October 19, 1976. I believe  
2 from your testimony that is because you did not measure the  
3 change in system by system, but you measured the industry  
4 average royalty payment or subscriber charge.

5 A That's the basic subscriber rate for all systems  
6 reporting in one category and all systems reporting in the  
7 other category. We had already submitted, of course, with the  
8 Neilson survey a system to system change back in our May filing.  
9 We thought this would add a new dimension to the information.

10 Q As I recall, the change in Neilson listed was 16  
11 percent.

12 A Close to it. Yes. It rounded to that.

13 Q The change that Mr. Cooper found measuring only systems  
14 with rates in both '76 and '78 was 15.15 percent. In both  
15 cases higher than the percent change that you have.

16 A I believe the Neilson survey was the whole industry.  
17 Mr. Cooper stated it was just the DSE systems.

18 Q Right. But that's measuring change rather than  
19 averaging rates, which is what you did.

20 Isn't the change in rate the relevant factor here,  
21 rather than the industry?

22 A I believe it could be both and I've included both.

23 Q Doesn't the statute speak in terms of a change?

24 A It does not say per system. It says change in basic  
25 rates, and here we see the industry-wide change in basic rates.

Q You interpreted that to mean a change in the industry

*Accurate Reporting Co., Inc.*

(202) 726-3801

JK-36

1 average?

2 MR. FELDSTEIN: Point of order. The statute states  
3 change in the average rates.

4 MR. ATTAWAY: Thank you.

5 BY MR. ATTAWAY:

6 Q Briefly on Chart 8, and I don't think it's necessary  
7 to put it up. This is the chart increase in additional set  
8 revenue again '78 and '80. Mrs. Beales, can you tell us  
9 what was the percent of total gross revenues accounted for  
10 by this change in the second set revenue? Any way you can  
11 estimate that?

12 A I could prepare that calculation. I do not have it  
13 with me.

14 Q • Could you estimate whether it would be a significant  
15 amount or a small amount?

16 A Once I did the calculation, I could estimate it. I  
17 don't have it.

18 Q I believe in your answer to one of my questions when  
19 I brought out the fact that you did not include second set  
20 revenue in your -- when you used the average charges reflected  
21 in the CRT questionnaire, that this omission was or would  
22 result in a very small change.

23 A I'm sorry. Could you repeat the question. I did  
24 not understand what you are asking me.

25 Q On Chart 3-C. I noticed that the average basis  
monthly -- I'm sorry. I'll wait until you get it.

*Accurate Reporting Co., Inc.*

(202) 726-3801

JK-37

1

A Thank you. I have it now.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Q I said that the average basic monthly subscriber rates listed in that chart were based on the CRT questionnaire which listed first set charges only. I said that that would tend to understate, excuse me. Overstate the revenue per subscriber. I believe you answered that the changes would be negligible, or very small.

A I don't recall saying that. I don't recall your asking me that particular question. I don't know that I said that. I'm sorry.

Q Well, I was just wondering if in fact you did say that the change would have been small, why you felt it was the increase in the second set rates was important enough to warrant your supplying us a chart showing a 12 percent increase. You have no idea how that 12 percent increase would be reflected in gross revenue or the royalty payment made by the cable systems?

A No. As I testified, we included the chart to give the Tribunal an indication that some of these other factors may have experienced an increase in the period we are discussing. But I do not have 1976 data, so that I cannot quantify this precisely over the entire period.

Q On Chart 9, and again, don't bother to put this up, you show additional factors affecting increase in royalty fee per subscriber. I think we have already established, have we not, that those two factors at least are not specifically

JK-38

1 mentioned by the statute when it listed the two factors upon  
2 which this decision is to be made?

3 MR. FELDSTEIN: Objection. That was your legal  
4 conclusion.

5 MR. ATTAWAY: Excuse me. The witness read the  
6 statute. The witness is competent to read.

7 CHAIRMAN BURG: The Tribunal knows what the statute  
8 says, but proceed here.

9 THE WITNESS: May I comment that I read the statute  
10 which said that royalty fee per subscriber. It did not say  
11 royalty fee per DSE, program or channel. It said per sub-  
12 scriber.

13 BY MR. ATTAWAY:

14 Q Mrs. Beales, I was referring to the two items listed  
15 under small 1 and small 2.

16 Let's go now to Chart 10. I believe we have already  
17 covered that. Excuse me. We started with that.

18 A couple of questions concerning your testimony on  
19 tierings. You stated that you examined CL Exhibit 10 and you  
20 said that 12 cities had granted -- 12 of the cities reflected  
21 in that Exhibit included in that Exhibit were granted fran-  
22 chises. Only three were in operation. Only one had any  
23 information with respect to the subscriber charges. Did you  
24 make any attempt to examine the subscriber charges and the  
25 tiers of the other 11 cities that granted franchises but are  
either not in operation or had no subscriber data?

*Accurate Reporting Co., Inc.*

(202) 726-3801

JK-39

1 A No. I did not. Of course, only two of them are  
2 offering the survey for free. The city selected. In all of  
3 the other cases, cable systems that were not willing to give  
4 their surveys for free in the first tier.

5 Q All of the others in the 12, or all of the others in  
6 the three that were in operation?

7 A In the 12. There are two that the city awarded  
8 their franchise to a company that was going to offer the first  
9 tier for free. All of the others are charging.

10 CHAIRMAN BURG: I thought there was one.

11 THE WITNESS: Those are the operational. There are  
12 three operational. He was asking about the other 12 that had  
13 been awarded.

14 BY MR. ATTAWAY:

15 Q All right, Mrs. Beales, I would now like to refer  
16 once again to the questionnaire that NCTA sent out to cable  
17 systems dated August 8, 1980, from Catherine Creech, referencing  
18 the copyright questionnaire. Would you read into the record  
19 the second paragraph in the cover letter?

20 A Second paragraph?

21 Q Yes, ma'am.

22 A "In 1977, you started paying copyright fees. The  
23 Copyright Tribunal will soon review the payment levels to  
24 determine if you should be paying more copyright fees. Part  
25 of the review is to find out if your subscriber rates have kept  
up with inflation for the period between October 19, 1976 and



JK-40

1 April 1, 1980."

2 Q So the cable systems that filled out this  
3 questionnaire were well aware of what use was going to be made  
4 of this information on this questionnaire, were they not?

5 A They presumably could have read this paragraph or  
6 did read this paragraph.

7 Q Incidentally, I don't know if this has any relevance  
8 to this proceeding but why did you say in 1977 you started  
9 paying copyright fees?

10 A I can't answer that. I noticed that right now  
11 myself.

12 Q I would like to see some of them.

13 COMMISSIONER BRENNAN: I don't think we would,  
14 Mr. Attaway.

15 (Laughter)

16 MR. FELDSTEIN: The Tribunal did not tell you about  
17 those.

18 (Laughter)

19 BY MR. ATTAWAY:

20 Q I'd like to go to Chart 13 and I think it would be  
21 well to display that.

22 Now, this chart reflects how you believe the small  
23 system category should be adjusted in light of inflation; is  
24 that correct?

25 A This chart reflects an example of the kind of adjust-  
ment that can be made, as I testified before.

*Accurate Reporting Co., Inc.*

(202) 726-3801

JK-41

1 Q In this example, you are making your adjustment  
2 based on the PCE; is that correct?

3 A In this adjustment, the figure we used was 30  
4 percent. That is roughly what the PCE deflator is.

5 Q Between October 1976 and April?

6 A Correct. March was the last month.

7 Q This adjustment is to be made according to the  
8 statute to assure that such -- excuse me -- to maintain the  
9 real constant dollar value of the exemption provided by such  
10 action; is that correct?

11 A I will take your word for it that it is in the Act.

12 Q Well, what was your purpose in making these adjust-  
13 ment?

14 A To show an increase in the category. In the gross  
15 receipts category. The kind of adjustments that could be made  
16 to the total gross receipts category.

17 Q You are suggesting to the Tribunal, though, that they  
18 make this adjustment or some similar adjustment to reflect  
19 the statutory requirement, though, are you not?

20 A Yes.

21 Q Which is to maintain the value of the example shown.

22 Now, if as I believe your examination of the CRT, the  
23 survey indicates basic rates increased 15 percent during this  
24 period. You adjust the dollar limitations by 30 percent.  
25 Aren't you shifting a large number of systems that paid in  
a higher category in 1976 down to a lower category in 1980, ..

JK-42

1 assuming that all the things stayed equal?

2 A Would you repeat the question?

3 Q If basic subscriber charges increased 15 percent and you  
4 adjust the dollar limitations 30 percent, you are shifting a  
5 large number of systems that were in a higher category in 1976  
6 into a lower category in 1980 or 1981, whenever this would go  
7 into effect?

8 A I am not a lawyer. In reading the Act, the interpre-  
9 tation that we had was an adjustment for inflation. This  
10 was an adjustment for inflation. The impact this has on the  
11 system, I have not worked out.

12 Q That's not a legal conclusion. As a matter of fact,  
13 let me work through a hypothetical with you. Maybe that will  
14 help us.

15 Let's take a hypothetical system with 1976 revenues  
16 of \$165,000. Had that system paid royalties in 1976, excuse me,  
17 semi-annual royalties of \$165,000, revenues. It's been a long  
18 day for both of us.

19 Let me start over again. Let's take a hypothetical  
20 cable system with 1976 semi-annual revenues of \$165,000. Is  
21 it correct that that system would have paid as DSE system?

22 A Yes. Semi-annually.

23 Q Semi-annually.

24 A Yes.

25 Q The limitation in the statute being \$165,000 semi-  
annual revenues.

JK-43

1 A Yes.

2 Q. If in 1980, that cable system's revenue had increased  
3 15 percent based on the industry average subscriber charge  
4 increase of 15 percent and it had no more subscribers as  
5 one of your systems did not gain subscribers through the years,  
6 its 1980 semi-annual gross subscriber revenues would be  
7 \$190,000; is that right?

8 A It sounds right.

9 Q If you multiply \$165,000 times 1.15, you get  
10 \$190,000. Now, if you multiply \$160,000, which is the existing  
11 ceiling, by 1.3, which would reflect a 30 percent increase  
12 which you are suggesting to the Tribunal, you would create a  
13 situation where this cable systems would now be in a small  
14 system category, and would not pay under the DSE formula; is  
15 that correct?

16 A In this example.

17 Q Was that your intent in making this recommendation?

18 A The intent in making this recommendation was to  
19 fulfill the requirement of the statute as I read it which  
20 said to adjust the gross receipts limitation for inflation.

21 Q If this situation were to occur, would not the value  
22 of the exemption provided by this section have changed?

23 A It depends on how you define value.

24 Q I assume value means the value of this small system  
25 exemption to the cable system. In 1976, it had no value because  
you had too much revenues. But the value is quite high in 1980

JK-44

1 because he's now a small business and he doesn't have to pay  
2 under the DSE formula. Is that a reasonable characterization?

3 A That's how you define value. You're a lawyer. I'm  
4 not a lawyer.

5 Q If you were a cable operator --

6 A I'm not a cable operator.

7 Q I think I've made my point.

8 Q One more question relating to the NCTA questionnaire.  
9 Was there any other advisory letters, notices, bulletins,  
10 relating to this survey?

11 A No.

12 Q What about the CRT survey? Did NCTA provide any  
13 assistance or encouragement to cable systems with respect to  
14 filling out and filing the CRT survey?

15 A We did not provide any assistance to the cable  
16 operators at all. I do recall and I'm not positive of this  
17 that we included an advisory in our president's weekly news-  
18 letter that said that CRT was sending out a questionnaire. That's  
19 the only thing I am positive that we did. But we did not  
20 provide assistance to cable operators.

21 Q All right, Mrs. Beales. Thank you for your patience.  
22 I just have a couple of summary questions.

23 Is it correct that the charts you have introduced  
24 reflect a number of factors that you feel are relevant to this  
25 proceeding including the changes in subscriber charges, the  
changes in the DSEs, increase into higher payment categories, etc.

*Accurate Reporting Co., Inc.*

(202) 726-3801

JK-45

1 A Yes.

2 Q You did not limit your examination to merely changes  
3 in charges to subscribers and inflation.

4 A I looked at royalty fee per subscriber.

5 Q That was foundation for everything that you did?

6 A I would say that is an accurate statement.

7 Q Mrs. Beales, in going through your charts and your  
8 testimony, I see that we have charts based on 1976 Fact Book data,  
9 Statement of Account data, CRT data, and NCTA survey data. What  
10 is the thread that holds all of this together? What is the  
11 basis from which all else grows that we can take something that  
12 we are sure of and relate it to all of these charts and all  
13 of the conclusions that you've reached?

14 A I don't know quite what you want me to tell you what  
15 you can be sure of. You can be sure that these charts reflect  
16 what I have testified it reflects.

17 Q But based on different sources of information; is  
18 that correct?

19 A Some of the points come from various sources of  
20 information, yes. I believe them to be an accurate reflection  
21 of the change in royalty fee per subscriber as we reported  
22 it.

23 Q Had you used one consistent source of information,  
24 would any of these charts have changed?

25 A I doubt it.

Q You're telling me that had you used the Fact Book

JK-46 1 throughout you would have reached all of the same conclusions?

2 A I have no way of knowing that. Obviously, parts of  
3 the information would not be available in from some of the  
4 sources, so I have no way of predicting what way it would come  
5 out. I am fairly confident -- I am confident in these numbers  
6 and I believe they would have come out the same way but I  
7 cannot --

8 Q Mrs. Beales, I'm not challenging the numbers  
9 themselves but the materials from which they are deprived. I'm  
10 having a very difficult time trying to follow them because each  
11 source is different. They are from different time periods,  
12 different reasons for the compilation.

13 A Is that a question?

14 Q No. Meandering a little. Very tired person.

15 MR. ATTAWAY: I think that is all the questions I have.  
16 Thank you very much for your patience.

17 CHAIRMAN BURG: Do you have any questions?

18 MR. FELDSTEIN: May I make a request and suggestion  
19 and all of the above. I believe that we can finish our  
20 redirect today in a half an hour. We have, because of the  
21 juggling of yesterday and the juggling of people's business  
22 schedules, we lost a businessman yesterday who came in on  
23 vacation and left, etc. I have two industry witnesses at  
24 this point who can make it tomorrow. If we are able to finish  
25 today, we can start with them. Mr. Attaway and I have talked  
about this. We can start with them at 10:00 tomorrow morning.

1           Before I commence my redirect, however, is it  
2 possible that I could have a short break?

3           COMMISSIONER BURG: Of course.

4           (A brief recess was taken.)

5           CHAIRMAN BURG: Proceed please.

6           MR. FELDSTEIN: Before I proceed with asking  
7 Mrs. Beales questions on redirect, with all due deference to  
8 the Tribunal and the past procedures which you have stated that  
9 you have adopted, for the record, I would like to state that  
10 the problem with allowing the Copyright Owners to use our  
11 witness in ostensible cross examination to introduce their  
12 exhibit, specifically CX-one, two and three, is that it denies  
13 us the opportunity to cross examine their exhibits. There is  
14 no response from the Copyright Owners' side.

15           We believe that our due process is denied thereby.  
16 We want to put it on the record and note it for the record, we  
17 intend to preserve our rights in appeal or whatever, if  
18 necessary.

19           CHAIRMAN BURG: So noted.

20           REDIRECT EXAMINATION

21           BY MR. FELDSTEIN:

22           Q   Mrs. Beales, Mr. Attaway led you through a reading  
23 exercise in the statute which did not tap your statistical  
24 expertise, but your ability to read. In reading that same  
25 statute and considering what might be relevant for your



1 numbers, immediately below little "i" and double little "i",  
2 how was your data constructed in terms of purpose? What were  
3 the words that you constructed your data on?

4 A I was interested in this portion of this sentence,  
5 and certainly the first portions, but the maintenance of that  
6 real constant dollar level of the royalty fee per subscriber  
7 which enacted as of the date of this act.

8 Q In doing so, how did you arrive at a decision as  
9 to what factors ought to be culled from the available data?

10 A I looked at all factors that could be culled. In  
11 reading this same paragraph, I found the sentence saying the  
12 Commission may consider all factors or rely together to the  
13 maintenance of such level of payment, including--and so on.

14 Q Thus, you read the potential of all factors being  
15 relevant to the maintenance of the royalty fee per subscriber?

16 A Right.

17 CHAIRMAN BURG: Mrs. Beales, you misspoke when you  
18 read that. You said "enacted" instead of "existed as of the  
19 date of this act."

20 THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Thank you. I've been  
21 reading too much today.

22 BY MR. FELDSTEIN:

23 Q Thus, in calculating the increase in royalty fee  
24 per subscriber, you included, not just increase in subscriber  
25 rate?

1 A That's correct.

2 Q Is that because the royalty fee per subscribers  
3 also increased when revenues from additional assets increase?

4 A Yes.

5 Q Is that also because the royalty fee per subscriber  
6 increases when the number of DSs carried by a system are increased?

7 A Yes.

8 Q Taking the questions in somewhat--the topics in  
9 somewhat the same order that Mr. Attaway did, in reviewing  
10 your data taken from NCTA Survey and the Copyright Royalty  
11 Tribunal Survey on regulatory restraint which, for your charts  
12 10 and 11?

13 A Yes.

14 Q And 11 and 12?

15 A That's right.

16 Q I notice in terms of delay on your chart 12, you  
17 used 3.5 months on the top line for delay between requests to  
18 a city and effectuation of a rate increase; is that correct?

19 A That's correct.

20 Q NCTA's showed that time period was how much?

21 A NCTA's result was 4.3 months.

22 Q Thus, you used the more conservative figure in your  
23 chart?

24 A Yes. I used the more conservative figure. Both  
25 figures, as I testified, are conservative, because we used a

1 four-week month as a standardized feature in tabulating both.  
2 Hence, the significant number of systems that waited more  
3 than a year, we added in 48 weeks instead of 52. It is conserva-  
4 tive for simplicity's sake.

5 Q Mr. Attaway also made a point about the fact that  
6 a significant percentage somewhere in the neighborhood of  
7 30 percent, as I recollect, of CATV systems responding to the  
8 CRTV Survey 27.7 percent indeed in the Copyright Owner's  
9 Exhibits were unrelated systems?

10 A Yes.

11 Q From the responses to the surveys, is it your view  
12 an unregulated system is truly unfeatured from a regulatory  
13 standpoint in terms of its rate increases?

14 A No. I saw examples where you could tell from the  
15 notes written that they were not truly unfeatured.

16 Q Can you describe a few of these types of situations  
17 for us?

18 A Some of them I have mentioned earlier, of course,  
19 where the city or regulatory body will tie feature rate  
20 increases to some fraction of an inflation measure, saying you  
21 can raise your rate any time you want as long as it is not  
22 more than 60 percent of the increase in inflation. There are  
23 time where the city will require cable systems to rebuild  
24 their plants before they can get a rate increase, add additional  
25 facilities, service programs and whatever. There are times

1 where the city will say you can raise your rate, but not more  
2 than once every year, every other year, every two years, as  
3 a condition, but you don't have to notice us.

4           There are times where the city will say you can  
5 raise your rate and you have to notify us and we will probably  
6 approve it, but we don't make any guarantees. Those are some  
7 examples.

8           Q       In other words, it is not unvarnished figure 27.7  
9 percent of CATV systems which are unregulated does not tell the  
10 whole story.

11           A       I believe that to be accurate.

12           Q       Thus, some so-called unregulated situations are  
13 in effected regulated situations are in effect regulated?

14           A       Certainly, to some extent.

15           Q       Thus, they are in the words of the statute,  
16 subject to some regulatory restraint?

17           A       That is correct.

18           Q       Turning again to NCTA Chart Number 12, this was the  
19 chart where the three types of time periods, one from the  
20 CRT Survey and two from the NCTA survey were added for a  
21 total time lag of 11 months. There was some confusion engendered  
22 by the 4.6 month period. Did you notice that the answers to  
23 this page were, so far as you can tell, virtually all figured  
24 out by systems which were subject to rate regulations?

25           A       Yes.

1 A Yes.

2 Q Thus, this 4.6 month time period was experienced  
3 because the systems were rate regulated?

4 A Yes.

5 Q This is because the regulated system must fill  
6 out a rate increase request?

7 A Yes. Certainly there is paperwork anytime you  
8 are involved in dealing with a regulatory body.

9 Q If there was a regulated system involved and it  
10 had decided internally that it needed a rate increase, would  
11 a time anywhere near this be needed?

12 A Not in my judgement.

13 MR. ATTAWAY: I have to object to this line of  
14 questioning. There is no foundation laid for the expertise  
15 of this witness. I believe she told me she had no experience  
16 in franchising.

17 MR. FELDSTEIN: She had no experience in filling  
18 out copyright forms.

19 CHAIRMAN BURG: Are you going to pursue this?

20 MR. FELDSTEIN: I'm through with that line of  
21 questioning.

22 BY MR. FELDSTEIN:

23 Q Mr. Attaway made a considerable point of criticizing  
24 the 1976 Fact Book. Did you or NCTA compile the 1978 Fact Book?

25 A No, we did not. It is produced by an organization

1 of TV Digest.

2 Q Despite the alleged limitations of the 1976 Fact  
3 Book, was not the data contained therein relied on and  
4 accepted by the Congress as evidenced by the legislative history?

5 A Yes.

6 COMMISSIONER JAMES: I don't see anything in the  
7 legislative history that indicates it was relied on as  
8 evidence.

9 MR. ATTAWAY: Moreover, I think the witness  
10 testified she does not know what Congress relied upon. She  
11 testified that the only thing she can be sure of is that  
12 10.8 million subscriber was contained in legislative history.

13 THE WITNESS: As was the 8.7 million figure.

14 CHAIRMAN BURG: Would you like to restate that  
15 question, Mr. Feldstein?

16 MR. FELDSTEIN: I will withdraw it.

17 BY MR. FELDSTEIN:

18 Q In your calculations, the various calculations,  
19 you used estimates as to the number of subscriber and the  
20 number of cable television systems existing in 1976; is that  
21 correct?

22 A That is correct.

23 Q Is that because there were no copyright or CRT  
24 Data in existence at that time?

25 A That is correct.

1 Q Now, you used the CRT Data for the 1976 basic  
2 subscriber rate; is that correct?

3 A That is correct.

4 Q It was obtained from the 1980 CRT Survey?

5 A That is correct.

6 Q Did you not use this because it was presumed to  
7 be a more accurate measure of the 1976 rates than some other  
8 type of estimates?

9 A Yes. It appeared to be a reasonable sized sample  
10 of cable systems, reporting their actual rate as of October 19,  
11 1976. It seemed to be a good source to rely upon.

12 Q Is it your understanding that the estimate in  
13 the legislative history were used by Congress in passing the  
14 Copyright Act?

15 A That is my understanding, because they utilized  
16 those figures in their legislative history.

17 COMMISSIONER JAMES. Both houses?

18 THE WITNESS: I believe it was only in the House  
19 Report.

20 BY MR. FELDSTEIN:

21 Q Did the House and the Senate bill differ?  
22 Maybe that's an unfair question.

23 A I really wish I had been there, but I was not.

24 Q Since the House version of Section 111 was embodied  
25 in the Copyright Act that was ultimately passed by the Congress,

1 did not take data relied upon in the House Report in the  
2 estimate of the royalty fee per subscriber?

3 A Yes.

4 COMMISSIONER JAMES: Counsel, let me ask you  
5 something for my clarification. I was not there. Wasn't that  
6 bill sent over to the House?

7 MR. FELDSTEIN: Yes.

8 COMMISSIONER JAMES: So, no one knows what the  
9 Senate considered?

10 MR. FELDSTEIN: We do know what law was passed.

11 COMMISSIONER JAMES. But, it originated in the  
12 Senate.

13 MR. FELDSTEIN: That's correct.

14 COMMISSIONER JAMES: Thank you.

15 BY MR. FELDSTEIN:

16 Q Does the estimate, in your view therefore, contained  
17 in the House Report the baseline, initial calculations as to  
18 royalty fee per subscriber from which the feature was intended  
19 to be measured?

20 A Yes.

21 MR. ATTAWAY: I object to that.

22 BY MR. FELDSTEIN:

23 Q Is that why you used the figure?

24 A Yes.

25 MR. ATTAWAY: The witness cannot testify as to



1 what Congress had in mind with respect to these figures  
2 unless there is some indication in the legislative history.  
3 She admitted she was not there.

4 MR. FELDSTEIN: Excuse me. She has indicated she  
5 has used those figures because of the fact that they appeared  
6 in the legislative history. That is why she presented the  
7 data she presented. She read, and it was put into evidence,  
8 the page in the House of Representative's Report, which stated  
9 underface that a necessary estimate had been made and that  
10 these were the figures they were relying upon. That is in  
11 Exhibit Three of NCTA.

12 MR. ATTAWAY: That is what Congress was relying on  
13 or that is what Mrs. Beales was relying on in doing her work?

14 MR. FELDSTEIN: Both.

15 MR. ATTAWAY: In that case, my objection stands.  
16 I see no basis from which Mrs. Beales or anyone else can  
17 determine what Congress was relying on.

18 MR. FELDSTEIN: It states they were relying on  
19 based on projections submitted by the interested parties.

20 CHAIRMAN BURG: To direct myself to the objection  
21 itself, I am going to sustain that. I understand what you  
22 are saying.

23 MR. ATTAWAY: Thank you.

24 BY MR. FELDSTEIN:

25 Q Did cable television pay copyright as of 1976?

1 A No.

2 Q Thus, you could not determine what the royalty fee  
3 per subscriber paid in 1976 was?

4 A That is correct.

5 Q Or would have been?

6 A That is correct.

7 Q So, there is no way of calculating the actual  
8 royalty fee per subscriber in 1976?

9 A That is correct.

10 Q Therefore, you had to rely on some estimates; is  
11 that not correct?

12 A That is correct.

13 Q What is the best estimate available to you?

14 A The best estimate and the only one I could find is  
15 contained in the legislative history.

16 Q Problem being raised in terms of the 1976 estimate,  
17 will there be a problem in subsequent review periods?

18 A Naturally, there will not because any procedure  
19 that is determined here will be utilized in future proceedings  
20 in the same methodology with actual data from cable systems who  
21 are paying royalty rates.

22 Q In reviewing the Copyright Owners Exhibit X-1a,  
23 which was the first completed form three which was handed out--  
24 perhaps it was the second one. In any event--

25 CHAIRMAN BURG: It was the second one.

1 COMMISSIONER JAMES: And, Texas was second.

2 CHAIRMAN BURG: We have our own self interests.

3 MR. FELDSTEIN: I did not mean to get into that.

4 BY MR. FELDSTEIN:

5 Q Mr. Attaway asked you to divide the  
6 basic sub into total gross revenue of the system which  
7 produced a royalty fee per subscriber level for that system;  
8 correct?

9 A Correct.

10 Q Is this the methodology you followed or did you  
11 sum those amounts from all forms?

12 A I summed the amounts from all forms. Then, I  
13 calculated the royalty fee per subscriber.

14 COMMISSIONER JAMES: May I ask a question? Working  
15 with numbers, if you had done it system by system and taken  
16 that average, would you have a figure?

17 THE WITNESS: In all probability, you would.

18 COMMISSIONER JAMES: Substantially different?

19 THE WITNESS: I don't know if it would be  
20 substantially different, but in this case, you are using the  
21 same base. You are not taking averages of averages which  
22 could be changed in magnitude for the system that increases the  
23 rate.

24 COMMISSIONER JAMES: You totalled all revenue  
25 and subscribers and divided?

1 THE WITNESS: Yes.

2 COMMISSIONER JAMES: If you had done it system  
3 by system, it could have been.

4 THE WITNESS: It could have been. We have worksheets  
5 that we could do it that way.

6 COMMISSIONER JAMES: Out of curiosity, could  
7 you do that and submit it during the rebuttal period later on?  
8 I would just like to see it.

9 THE WITNESS: Sure.

10 BY MR. FELDSTEIN:

11 Q Did you rely upon the accuracy of the data reported  
12 in the forms you studied?

13 A Yes, I did.

14 Q Did you attempt to reject those that, on their  
15 face, showed a deficiency or inaccuracy?

16 A I rejected the forms that did not include the  
17 relevant information, did not include a figure for subscriber  
18 or if they had no page for the royalty fee missing, I would  
19 reject those systems. But, I did not go back and calculate  
20 every system, whether they had accurately filled out their  
21 form.

22 Q Assuming some of the forms were inaccurate that  
23 you used in terms of the revenues or the number of subscribers  
24 they reported, in your opinion, would the errors that would have  
25 appeared on such forms be more likely to have overstated or  
understated the results which you reached?

*Accurate Reporting Co., Inc.*

(202) 726-3801

1 MR. ATTAWAY: Excuse me, Madam Chairman. I  
2 have to object to the way that question was phrased. I, in  
3 my cross examination, never suggested that the statement of  
4 account reflected inaccurate information. What I said was that  
5 there was not sufficient information. I think there is a  
6 major difference, and that should be pointed out.

7 MR. FELDSTEIN: I will rephrase the question.

8 CHAIRMAN BURG: Mr. Feldstein, would you  
9 like to rephrase the question? You are withdrawing the question.

10 MR. FELDSTEIN: Yes, and pursue this.

11 BY MR. FELDSTEIN:

12 Q Do you believe that there was sufficient information  
13 on those forms for you to accomplish the study that you  
14 accomplished?

15 A Yes.

16 Q Was there anything on the forms that suggested  
17 to you that there may have been overstatements or understatements?

18 A I cannot isolate specific examples, but I'm sure  
19 everybody makes errors and errors go both ways. I doubt that.  
20 I did not see specific examples that I felt were so out of  
21 line or the cable system could have made an error. I did not  
22 see forms like that. I found incomplete forms and those were  
23 rejected. We still analyzed the vast majority of the forms  
24 submitted during that period.

25 Q Mr. Attaway has taken, and I refer to NCTA

1 Exhibit Three B. In cross examining you on NCTA Exhibit 3-B-A,  
2 Mr. Attaway has attempted to draw differences between the break-  
3 down of DSE systems and small systems on this exhibit and  
4 the exhibit which was submitted in May.

5 A That is correct. There were differences in the two.

6 Q Can you explain once again as you did on your  
7 direct testimony the difference in the methodologies which  
8 were used?

9 A In the estimate we provided to the Tribunal in  
10 May, we relied on worksheets which we found in our files  
11 and found an estimate based on studies that were conducted  
12 by NCTA and MPAA were these estimated DSEs would average out  
13 to about 2.5. In the current chart which has been submitted,  
14 we decided that it would be good to utilize only publicly  
15 available information. We would not be in a position to try  
16 to second guess what Congress or the interested parties would  
17 be providing. So, we conducted, we analyzed the same informa-  
18 tion. We utilized publicly available information and came  
19 up with a slightly different estimate of the royalty fee per  
20 subscriber for DSEs systems.

21 However, it should be noted the estimates are  
22 very close. The DSE systems, as appears in terms of the royalty  
23 fee, as appears of 8.7 million comes out to be very similar  
24 and similar to the amount the Copyright Office tells me is  
25 being collected. They do not tabulate their data that way..

1 It is based on their impression. So, we don't have a hard  
2 number on that.

3 Q You calculated this -- you calculated NCTA  
4 Exhibit 3-B by calculating copyright for small systems.  
5 and you subtracted what you had for large systems.

6 A That is correct.

7 Q In the May exhibit from old NCTA worksheets, it  
8 was for large systems and that was subtracted from 8.7 million  
9 and you got the copyright for small systems.

10 A That is correct.

11 Q Those two results were similar alike?

12 A Quite similar.

13 Q To ask you to repeat the point you made a moment  
14 ago, in both cases, it is percentage of the total copyright  
15 payments paid by the DSEs systems were similar?

16 A Yes. It was a substantial amount of the total  
17 fees that are paid in.

18 Q In the real experience in 78-1, 78-2 and 79-1 and  
19 two has also tracked close to that percentage.

20 A It is estimated by people I talked to in the Copy-  
21 right Office. They do not break out data by how many is paid  
22 in each form. They give how much is paid out in each system.  
23 They do give an estimate. They do track closely.

24 Q In Copyright Exhibit -- Copyright Owners Exhibit 1-a,  
25 with is the Wisconsin Form Three which Mr. Attaway attempted  
to question you on the use of the number of subscribers.

1 A That is correct.

2 Q You stated that you used the first set of numbers.

3 A Yes, we did.

4 Q He asked you, I believe, did he not, whether the  
5 revenues from hotel-motel, hop, et cetera, were included in  
6 gross revenues that you used?

7 A Yes. He asked me that.

8 Q Your answer was?

9 A Yes. I assumed so. I have not worked thorough  
10 calculations for this system in detail.

11 Q He asked if that was done, whether the royalty  
12 fee per subscriber might be, if that was done on the average  
13 that the RFP might be or have been calculated a bit higher than  
14 it actually is. In your opinion, if that was done for each  
15 cable system, is he correct that there might be some overstate-  
16 ment?

17 A If every cable system had included revenues from  
18 hotel-motel, commercials, hop and elderly and so on, if  
19 there was a significant reporting of that in every case, yes.  
20 That would change it.

21 Q Have you examined what the worst case in such a  
22 situation might be?

23 A Well, that looks like a good worst case in the  
24 Copyright Owners Exhibit. That is a far more complicated  
25



1 form than I generally had seen in my statement of account  
2 forms.

3 COMMISSIONER JAMES: What do you generally see?

4 THE WITNESS: I saw many systems had additional  
5 set of revenues. Very few systems had FM revenues. Some  
6 reported varying amounts of hotel-motel written down with  
7 different methodologies as in this example. They tell you  
8 they have five at \$7.50. That is the first outlet right,  
9 and some at \$1.50.

10 So, you cannot calculate exactly how much that  
11 contributes. That is why we did not include it. We took  
12 a sample internally when we started the process and found  
13 these factors to be what I considered relatively insignificant.

14 COMMISSIONER JAMES: Would reconnection be  
15 included under other services; outlet relocation?

16 THE WITNESS: Is this in F--

17 CHAIRMAN BURG: The bottom block one.

18 THE WITNESS: As I read the form, I believe they  
19 include in gross receipts the revenues gained from  
20 secondary transmission services.

21 BY MR. FELDSTEIN:

22 Q Thus, the block in the bottom is not to be  
23 included in gross revenues?

24 A The instructions under "K", gross receipts enter  
25 the total of all amounts, gross receipts paid to your cable

1 system by subscriber for the system secondary transmission  
2 service.

3 COMMISSIONER JAMES: Can you take that, and I  
4 hate to put you through the exercise, but I sure would like  
5 to have you to get it for me. Backtrack to see just how  
6 they got it. I'm on X-1, get the gross revenues and apply  
7 the same base rate, and see if you can come up with the same  
8 subscribers. I want to see what figure is included in  
9 gross revenue.

10 THE WITNESS: I cannot divide the gross revenue  
11 by a basic figure. As you can see, there are a lot of  
12 different basic rates listed: \$7.50, \$1.75, and so on.

13 COMMISSIONER JAMES: I thought they only took the  
14 first set rate.

15 BY MR. FELDSTEIN:

16 Q They have included, have they not, revenues from  
17 the first set?

18 A That is correct.

19 Q Revenues from additional sets?

20 A Yes.

21 Q And revenues from other commercial outlets which  
22 are found in block one and block two? Then, they have  
23 excluded the revenues reported in Section F on the bottom  
24 of the page?

25 A That is my understanding of how a system would

1 calculate this.

2 COMMISSIONER JAMES: We don't really know. That's  
3 what I'm trying to figure out.

4 THE WITNESS: The instructions say to take all  
5 amounts paid to your cable system by subscribers to systems  
6 secondary transmission service, the basic service of retransmit-  
7 ting television and radio broadcasts during the accounting  
8 period.

9 So, that would seem to correspond with the  
10 secondary transmission service Section E. Section F is  
11 service other than secondary transmission.

12 COMMISSIONER JAMES: I asked the question of the  
13 Copyright Owners. Has your organization done any verification  
14 or checking on a survey basis with some of the gross receipts  
15 that have to be reported in the franchise cities to see if  
16 those reports are coming up similar?

17 THE WITNESS: Not to my knowledge. In fact, I  
18 had not thought about the suggestion you made as a way of  
19 checking, no. We have not conducted a survey like that.

20 COMMISSIONER JAMES: Thank you.

21 BY MR. FELDSTEIN:

22 Q The \$1.08 that we have come up with as a royalty  
23 fee per subscriber for the January 1, 1980, have you been  
24 able to find an alternative method to check the accuracy of  
25 that figure?

1           A       Well, I have an alternative method. Yes. It  
2 checks the accuracy, tells me if it is in the right rank.

3           Q       Can you tell us what that was and what the results  
4 were?

5           A       If you were to utilize a similar technique as  
6 employed back in '76 to rely on the Television Fact Book  
7 data and compare it with the total amount collected by the  
8 Copyright Office in the royalty fees, you would have essentially  
9 the variables that go into the calculation. The last time  
10 I had talked with someone at the Copyright Office, which was  
11 on the 17th of September, I understand \$8,160,140.82 had been  
12 collected for the 79-2 period. The 1980 Fact Book estimate  
13 total subscribers as of January 1, 1980 as 15.5 million  
14 subscribing households. If you divide those numbers out,  
15 you come out with 52 cents for a six-month period or \$1.04,  
16 depending on rounding, it would be \$1.05, in royalty fee per  
17 subscriber.

18                   When you compare that, it's an increase of over  
19 28 percent. It looks like the Fact Book contains the same  
20 methodology as used in '76. You know the figure is certainly  
21 in the ballpark. As a reseracher, I'm not trying to sit here  
22 and say this is precisely the number. You cannot do that when  
23 you rely on an estimate for the start date. What you have to  
24 be able to do is to look at the percentage increase and in  
25 every way I have calculated, it has come up about 30 percent,

1 slightly more or less, but right around 30 percent.

2 I think the estimate we have made is as accurate as we can  
3 possibly make them.

4 CHAIRMAN BURG: Forgive me if I'm being repetitious.  
5 You may have answered this. In this X-1 form in block one  
6 service to first set 4,341, service to additional 1,115, did  
7 you add those two figures?

8 THE WITNESS: No, you cannot do that. You are trying  
9 to get subscribers. It is not set by households or units.  
10 It is not a per set basis. 11,114 additional sets are  
11 located in homes already that have cable service to them.  
12 So, we did not add them together because we were getting a  
13 subscriber household data per subscriber.

14 CHAIRMAN BURG: The reason I asked is because  
15 in the instructions on the top of the page under block one,  
16 note for an individual or organizations receiving service  
17 that falls under different categories that person or entity  
18 should be counted as a subscriber in each applicable category.  
19 That is what is throwing me off.

20 THE WITNESS: If I added the two numbers together  
21 additional and first set, I would overstate the number of  
22 subscriber households considerably. I have based my calculations on subscriber households.

23 CHAIRMAN BURG: Thank you.

24 BY MR. FELDSTEIN:

25 Q Let me ask you this question: Was the reason that

1 you based your calculation on subscriber or subscribing house-  
2 hold units based on what the Copyright Act speaks in terms of  
3 per subscriber?

4 A Yes.

5 Q It does not speak in terms of per set?

6 A Correct.

7 Q Or per program or DS?

8 A That's correct.

9 Q But, per subscriber?

10 A That is correct.

11 MR. FELDSTEIN: I have no more questions.

12 CHAIRMAN BURG: Mrs. Beales, thank you so very  
13 much. You have been a very good witness. Mr. Feldstein,  
14 we will adjourn for today. You will present your next witness  
15 at 10:00 tomorrow morning.

16 MR. ATTAWAY: Before we adjourn, Mr. Korn promised  
17 the Tribunal a redraft of his last exhibit corrected for two  
18 errors Commissioner Garcia pointed out to our mutual embarrass-  
19 ment. It was the exhibit responding to Commissioner James'  
20 request for a comparison of how royalties or how systems of  
21 previous exhibits would pay under a system by system procedure  
22 and under an industry-wide procedure.

23 CHAIRMAN BURG: It is CO Exhibit 18.

24 (CO Exhibit No. 18 was marked for identification  
25 and received into evidence.)

\*\*\*

1 CHAIRMAN BURG: Is that all you have for the  
2 moment?

3 MR. ATTAWAY: Yes.

4 CHAIRMAN BURG: We will now adjourn.

5 (Whereupon, at 4:22 p.m., the hearing was  
6 adjourned to reconvene the following morning at 10:00 a.m.)

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25